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BERKELEY — Harry R. Wellman, who took over as acting president of the University of California in 1967 after angry UC regents fired Clark Kerr, has died after a long illness.

Wellman, who died Monday, was 98.

Born in Alberta, Canada, on March 4, 1899, Mr. Wellman held master’s and doctorate degrees from UC Berkeley.

Known by colleagues as a quiet facilitator, Mr. Wellman started working for the university in 1925 as an extension specialist in agricultural economics. He became vice president of agricultural sciences and was instrumental in the development of teaching and research programs.

In 1958, Mr. Wellman was named to the newly created post of vice president of the university, serving as second in command to Kerr.

In the years that followed, Mr. Wellman helped run the university as the modern UC structure was created through Kerr’s California Master Plan For Education.

Mr. Wellman officially retired from the university in 1966 as vice president emeritus, and agricultural economist emeritus. But in 1967, he took over as acting president when Kerr was ousted in a bitter dispute rooted in the emerging campus activism that began with the Free Speech Movement.

“He was very influential in keeping agriculture moving ahead in the state of California,” Kerr said.

He credited Mr. Wellman with running the entire UC system in the years Kerr was heavily engaged in putting the master plan into effect.

Mr. Wellman is survived by his daughter, Nancy Jane Parmelee; son-in-law Robert Parmelee; three grandchildren; and three great-grandchildren.

In lieu of flowers, gifts may be made to the Harry R. Wellman Fund for Support of Graduate Students in Natural Resource Economics or to the First Congregational Church of Berkeley, 2345 Channing Way.

A memorial service will be at 2 p.m. Aug. 30 at First Congregational Church in Berkeley.
OBITUARIES

Harry Wellman

Harry Wellman, the administrator who ran the University of California at Berkeley for a year after Clark Kerr was fired, died yesterday after a long illness. He was 98.

After more than 40 years of service to the university, Mr. Wellman postponed his retirement in 1967 to take over for Kerr. He helped stabilize the university at a tumultuous time: Kerr was dismissed by the Board of Regents in response to student protests that began with the 1964 free speech movement.

"Harry was not a dramatic person doing dramatic things," Kerr said. "He was a quiet facilitator, who was able, by friendly persuasion, to impact the university in a quiet effective way."

Born in Alberta, Canada, Mr. Wellman graduated from the Oregon Agricultural College in 1921 before coming to UC Berkeley, where he earned his master's and Ph.D. degrees.

Mr. Wellman began working for the university in 1925, while finishing his Ph.D., as a specialist in agricultural economics. He became a professor in 1940, then rose to the position of vice president of agricultural sciences in 1952. In that post, he played a key role in the development of teaching and research in campus agricultural programs.

In 1958, with a promotion to the newly created post of university vice president, he became second-in-command to Kerr.

In that position, he helped decentralize authority in the university — giving more power to the campuses.

Kerr was a chief architect of California's Master Plan for Higher Education, a task that took him away from some daily administration of the university. He credits Mr. Wellman with running the university during that process.

Mr. Wellman announced his retirement from the university in 1966, but agreed to stay on to serve as interim president after Kerr's dismissal in January 1967.

"It's only my affection for this university which makes me accept this job," Mr. Wellman said at the time, making no secret of his admi-

ration for Kerr.

Loren Furtado, a former assistant vice president, said "The university was greatly traumatized by the firing of Kerr. Mr. Wellman helped bring about tranquility and alleviate tension."

Mr. Wellman is survived by his daughter, Nancy Jane Parmelee, son-in-law Robert Parmelee, three grandchildren and three great grandchildren.

The family asks that gifts be made to the Harry R. Wellman Fund for Support of Graduate Students in Natural Resource Economics, or to the First Congregational Church of Berkeley, 2345 Channing Way, Berkeley, Calif. 94704.

A memorial service will be held at 2 p.m. on August 30 at the First Congregational Church in Berkeley.

Kenneth Allan

A memorial service for Kenneth Allan, a Hollywood film and labor figure who died Wednesday, will be held at 3 p.m. Sunday in the Firehouse in Fort Mason in San Francisco.
Harry R. Wellman, who interrupted his retirement to serve as acting UC president from 1967 to 1968, died Aug. 18 at the age of 93.
Memorial services will be held Aug. 30 at 2 p.m. at the First Congregational Church in Berkeley.

Known by colleagues as a "quiet facilitator," Wellman started work at the university in 1925 as an extension specialist in agricultural economics and played a key role in the shifting of most administrative authority from the president's office to the campuses.
The campus's Wellman Hall was named for him in 1967.

"Throughout his long and distinguished career as an agricultural economist and university administrator, Harry Wellman's name was synonymous with the highest standards of integrity, skill and service to the university and to California agriculture. Both have lost a dedicated steward and a faithful friend," said C. Judson King, UC provost and senior vice president for academic affairs.

"Harry was not a dramatic person doing dramatic things," said former UC President Clark Kerr. "He was a quiet facilitator, who was able, by friendly persuasion, to impact the university in a quiet effective way."

Born in Alberta, Canada, on March 4, 1899, Wellman received his bachelor of science degree from the Oregon Agricultural College in 1921. He received his master's degree in 1924 and his PhD degree in 1926 from Berkeley. In 1960, he was awarded an honorary law degree from Oregon State University.

"Wellman was very influential in keeping agriculture moving ahead in the state of California," Kerr said.

Following a reorganization of administrative offices in 1958, Wellman was named to the newly created post of vice president of the university, serving as second in command to President Kerr.

Wellman officially retired from the university in 1966, with titles of vice president emeritus of the university, professor emeritus of agricultural economics and agricultural economist emeritus in the agricultural experiment station and Giannini Foundation.

In addition to his service with the university, Wellman was chief of the general crop section of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration from 1934 to 1935. He was a director of the Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco from 1943 to 1954. He was also a member of the California Board of Agriculture.

Wellman's scholarly work centered on price analysis, marketing and agricultural policy, particularly in relationship to California fruit and vegetable crops.

He is survived by his daughter, Nancy Jane Parmelee, son-in-law Robert Parmelee, three grandchildren and three great grandchildren.

In lieu of flowers, gifts should be made to the Harry R. Wellman Fund for Support of Graduate Students in Natural Resource Economics, or to the First Congregational Church of Berkeley, 2345 Channing Way.
All uses of this manuscript are covered by a legal agreement between the Regents of the University of California and Harry R. Wellman dated 12 January 1976. The manuscript is thereby made available for research purposes. All literary rights in the manuscript, including the right to publish, are reserved to The Bancroft Library of the University of California at Berkeley. No part of the manuscript may be quoted for publication without the written permission of the Director of The Bancroft Library of the University of California at Berkeley.

Requests for permission to quote for publication should be addressed to the Regional Oral History Office, 486 Library, and should include identification of the specific passages to be quoted, anticipated use of the passages, and identification of the user. The legal agreement with Harry R. Wellman requires that he be notified of the request and allowed thirty days in which to respond.
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INTRODUCTION

For more than fifty years, as graduate student, faculty member, extension economist, head of the Giannini Foundation, Vice President of Agriculture, Academic Vice President, Acting President, and in post-retirement services, Harry Wellman has been many things to many people in the University of California and throughout the state. There are devoted friends who go so far as to call him "Mr. University of California." Once a chancellor's wife remarked that "Dr. Wellman is the granddaddy of our campus"—to the utter astonishment of several other chancellors' wives, each of whom felt sure the title should apply to "her" campus. His service and pervading devotion to the University are all the more remarkable because so much of his role has been played behind the scenes—in his office, in the field, in Sacramento, at the conference table, in personal consultation or private correspondence. Only in the last year of active service (1967-68) did he assume the stellar role, but even then he characteristically refused the title of President and insisted upon being called Acting President—"to hold the fort" until a new president could be found and appointed.

His impact on the development of the University, as well as on its activities in the field of agriculture, has left an indelible mark on the present character and quality of all elements of the University of California and on its relationships to the citizens of the State. It is therefore importantly fitting that the University archives will now have Dr. Wellman's memoir on its shelves. We are deeply sensitive to the honor of making these prefatory remarks.

Because Canadian-born Harry Wellman is unusually modest and even diffident about himself and the work he has done, we are taking the privilege of reviewing some of the factors in his story which have molded him and of suggesting the importance of at least some of his many contributions.

It will be of interest to the reader to note how, at every stage of his life, Harry impressed competent and perceptive individuals who sometimes were able to change or even direct the course of his development and interests.

For instance, even in his early years of work on his father's ranch, the older men working with him soon sensed that here was a responsible and unusually intelligent youth who could be put in charge of machinery and animals as well as the planting and harvesting of crops. Incidentally, the reader will find Harry's description of rural life during the first two decades of this century both lucid and illuminating.
That he was a gifted student is apparent when one realizes that he completed high school in three years at the age of seventeen. He had been the top student scholastically in his class. During his senior year he was a member of the baseball team, a member of the debating society, had the lead role in the high school play, and was also manager of the high school annual, the Cynosure.

Before his mother died (when Harry was only one year old), she had asked her husband to promise to see that the children would be properly educated. The circumstances pertaining to the selection of a college for Harry shows the important influence of two men. Since the family had earlier moved to eastern Oregon, it was logical for geographic reasons that the Washington Agricultural College not far above the state line at Pullman, Washington, should be chosen. But during his senior year in high school Harry had become acquainted with Howard Belton, then employed to test the butterfat content of the milk cows on the various farms of the region. (Belton later became treasurer of the State of Oregon.) There was also Frank Dietsch who was Harry's favorite high school teacher; one can surmise that Harry was his favorite pupil. Both Belton and Dietsch were graduates of Oregon Agricultural College (now Oregon State University) at Corvallis, and through their combined efforts they recruited Harry for their Alma Mater where he enrolled in the fall of 1916, to receive the B.S. degree and a Phi Beta Kappa key in 1921 with a major in Farm Management.

As a result of a chance meeting at an Epworth League gathering in Corvallis, Harry had joined the Oxford Club, a local fraternity which later became Sigma Phi Epsilon and which had the tradition of high scholarship. Professor Dubach, the faculty advisor of the fraternity, and Professor N.H. Comish, who taught Economics and Marketing, had a long-term influence on Harry. He had entered college knowing that he did not wish to be a farmer and he planned to major in mechanical engineering, but eventually was persuaded by Comish to change to farm management, a major which would allow Harry to emphasize marketing in which he was interested.

Twice his collegiate career was interrupted--first because of the serious illness and subsequent death of his father in 1917 and, secondly, because he enlisted in the navy in 1918. Nevertheless by the end of the winter quarter in 1921 he had met all requirements for graduation. A visit with the state leader of the 4-H clubs, H.C. Seymour, resulted in an intensive quizzing and then the quick offer of a position with the Oregon Agricultural Extension Service as 4-H Club Agent in Malheur County. In June Harry returned to Corvallis for commencement and Comish, a Wisconsin graduate, urged him to go on for graduate studies--of course, at the University of Wisconsin.
This memoir again indicates how, during his subsequent years of graduate study, at Wisconsin and then at the University of California, perceptive men such as Benjamin H. Hibbard and Harry E. Erdman sized up the talents of Harry Wellman and helped him steer a course to fit those talents. Later, after he had received the M.S. and Ph.D. degrees at Berkeley and had become an Extension Specialist in Agricultural Economics (1925-34), Dr. Howard Tolley took him to Washington for a short period during the summer of 1933 and there he met Jesse Tapp. The following year Tolley and Tapp selected Wellman to take a leave of absence from the University for one year to act as Chief of the General Crops Section in the Agricultural Adjustment Administration.

That the character of his family had played a significant part in the development of Harry Wellman goes without saying, and is apparent throughout his story. In one place, he observes: "If any of the brothers and sisters deserve the appellation 'sterling character,' it is Emma." Emma is the sister who assumed the role of mother during much of his youth.

Both of us have known Harry for more than two score years, one as a graduate student studying under Wellman's supervision, both of us as faculty members and also as academic administrators in the University. From these years of intimate experience, in both work and relaxation, we can say with the deepest conviction and without fear of contradiction that Harry R. Wellman, like his beloved sister, deserves to be known as a "sterling character." There is ample evidence throughout this memoir that members of the Wellman family were dedicated to constructive work, to high standards of conduct and thought, and to affectionate consideration of others. These were the deeply embedded traits which Harry Wellman brought to California.

Perhaps it was when Harry married Ruth Gay in 1922 that he gained the most subtly important help and influence on his adult life. This trim, energetic, gentle little lady has always understood his need for a well-ordered home where he could relax in comfort and pleasure and to which he could freely bring friends or those with whom he wished to talk in confidence. Generous in hospitality, quick in attention to detail, and with the endearing gifts of sympathy and silence, she loyally put the work of the University above her personal interests. She tended her garden and took part when she could in the activities of the faculty wives and other organizations, but she tailored her own way of life to fit that of her husband. She could pack her bag quickly for a trip to another campus in California or abroad. As she has often quaintly put it, she just "goes along for the ride."
In going along for the ride, Ruth had a busy man to keep up with. For a quick summary of the parts he played in the University of California, one need only look at the long biographical list on page xii. Even a brief listing is impressive:

At Berkeley

1923-25: Research Assistant--Agricultural Economics
1925-34: Extension Specialist in Agricultural Economics
1934-35: Chief, General Crops Section, Agricultural Adjustment Administration in Washington, D.C., while on leave from the Berkeley campus
1935-39: Associate Agricultural Economist
1937-39: Associate Professor of Agricultural Economics
1939-68: Agricultural Economist and Professor of Agricultural Economics
1942-52: Director of the Giannini Foundation of Agricultural Economics and Chairman of the Department of Agricultural Economics

State-wide

1952-58: Vice President of Agricultural Sciences
1958-68: Vice President of the University
1963-65: Acting Vice President--Finance
1967: Acting President
1968: Professor of Agricultural Economics Emeritus
       Vice President of the University Emeritus

He served on many committees both within and outside the University pages xiii-xvi. At one time or another he was on almost all of the important Academic Senate committees as well as on major faculty committees in the College of Agriculture, the School of Business Administration, the Institute of Social Sciences, the Institute of Industrial Relations, and on numerous administrative committees, especially from 1952 onward. Even after retirement, he undertook extensive duties on President Hitch's Growth Plan Task Force (1970-72) and the Theodore R. Meyer Memorial Fund (1973-74). In recent years he has given extensively of his time and talent toward improvements in the status and economic well-being of those in retirement and to activities of the Berkeley Alumni Association. Occasional travel and frequent lawn bowling matches (which he approaches with the same quiet, scientific dedication that has marked his entire career) are important activities in Harry's life today, but continued dedicated service to his University is the real hallmark of his retirement.
In the same listing one can find an extensive, if incomplete, record
of worthy causes for public service to which he gave of his energies and
wisdom. Included are the State Board of Agriculture, the U.S. Forest
Service, the State Colleges, the Land Grant Colleges (for instance, the
negotiating committee for AID, the committee on foreign technical
cooperation), and the YMCA. For a number of years he was a director of
the Federal Reserve Bank and at various times served as consultant to the
U.S. Agricultural Adjustment Administration, U.S. Office of Price Administra-
tion and the U.S. War Food Administration.

Obviously it would be impossible in this limited space to review all
of the constructive work done by Harry Wellman in these many areas of
service, but we cannot omit comment on his contributions to the University
as a faculty member, an agricultural economist, and an administrator.

Harry Wellman's original appointment in agricultural extension
developed a strong sense of service to agriculture and the people of
California. His early research dealt largely with economic outlook for
agricultural commodities focusing on factors affecting demand, supply,
and prices. This early work set a pattern of industry-oriented research
that became an important element in the research program of the Giannini
Foundation for decades to follow. Later he was to contribute importantly
to the development of marketing agreements as a means of improving marketing
of agricultural products and adding to the stability and economic well-being
of California agriculture.

After joining the teaching faculty of the University and assuming his
duties as Director of the Giannini Foundation and chairman of the Department
of Agricultural Economics, his research contributions added a strong public
policy dimension reflecting his continued commitment to serving public needs
through research. His faculty colleagues and graduate students were
unquestionably influenced by example and, during the forties and fifties,
the Giannini Foundation under his direction was held in the highest esteem
across the nation and abroad as a center of graduate study and research.

As a classroom instructor and graduate student mentor, Harry received
uniformly top marks from his students. In his quiet, disarming manner he
evoked a quality of thought and clarity of analysis from his students in
dealing with real issues of the time unmatched in any other class on the
Berkeley campus in which they enrolled. From this experience has grown a
deep respect and appreciation in two generations of professional agricultural
economists.

It was inevitable that Harry's administrative skills, his commitment
to agriculture, and his widespread respect both within and outside the
University would lead to his appointment as Vice President of Agricultural
Sciences in 1952. It was his lot to resolve several difficult organizational issues in the agricultural sciences including the distribution of programs among campuses, the consolidation of certain related programs into simple departments to improve quality and efficiency, and further development of the system of agricultural field stations which provide essential support for the research and extension programs. Harry demonstrated a rare combination of academic judgment, sensitivity to human needs, and courage of conviction which set in motion a pattern of change essential at the time. Significantly, it provided a model for subsequent program adjustment in the University.

When Harry Wellman assumed the duties of Vice President--Agricultural Sciences, he was involved in the growth of the University state-wide not only with respect to agriculture but also including the expansion and building of colleges of liberal arts at Davis and Riverside. When he became Vice President of the University (1958) he was intimately concerned with all campuses which soon included building more new campuses. Parenthetically, it is of significance to note that when Clark Kerr was offered the presidency of the University, he accepted with the stipulation that Harry Wellman be made the Vice President, which was, of course, done.

In fulfilling the demands of his office, Harry operated like a computer with the personal qualities of a saint. Any administrator or faculty member knew that he could go to the Vice President whatever his problem, and that close attention would be paid to the problem and to its satisfactory solution. Harry has always had an uncanny talent for sizing up a situation or a person, giving careful consideration to all angles involved, and then almost always finding an equitable, useful, and often innovative solution. He invariably did his "home work," keeping in mind the necessary background, including an assessment of the resources needed. He could lighten a tight situation with a pertinent funny story, but he could also be firm in holding to his high principles of what would be best for the University, and he has been known to be sternly adamant when the occasion required. An administrative officer, taking a difficult question or problem to Harry, would always receive from him, clearly delineated, the resources available for proceeding with the solution, and the responsibilities of his own campus in the matter. No wonder Harry became the "granddaddy" of more than one campus.

It can be truthfully stated that there is no facility in the University system which does not have buildings that came about because Harry Wellman found ways to help plan and pay for them. It can be fairly said that during Harry's Vice Presidency when a faculty member was ready for promotion to tenure, his dossier had been carefully read and annotated by the Vice President, always with regard not only to the welfare of the candidate but to the needs
of his campus or the University as a whole. If a problem of discipline arose, Harry would know the facts and have a suggestion. If a matter related to the local community or the state legislature, Harry would know or make himself acquainted with the necessary facts and in his analytical way would have found a solution to suggest. Some of these contributions are evasive of analysis and explication, but all point to the impact of Harry Wellman on each campus and facility of the University of California.

As a go-between for the President of the University, Harry was superb. Often, indeed, he assumed the difficult tasks that might prove embarrassing to his superior. Somehow he managed this without incurring permanent displeasure from faculty members, administrators, clerical staff, or The Regents.

Because of his impeccable tact and pervasive fairness, one wonders if the course of University affairs during the difficult years of the sixties would have been different had Harry not happened to be away on a long-delayed and much needed vacation in other parts of the world when President Kerr and Chancellor Meyerson announced to news media rather than directly to The Regents their decisions to resign. Again one wonders what solution he might have found had he been called on for help during the events of the Free Speech Movement. It is pertinent to say that he did not believe in compromise; he believed in compromise only if, taking fully into account the best, long-term interests of the University, it did not infringe upon a rational solution.

Perhaps the greatest debt Californians owe Harry Wellman results from his willingness, when ready for an earned retirement, to pick up the pieces and "hold the fort" as Acting President when the President had been dismissed. Students were in rebellious mood, the faculty and academic affairs in general were clearly reflecting the stresses of the times, and the support of the Legislature was ebbing. At no time did the University ever need a steady hand at the wheel so much as then. Harry was there on the bridge.

It is clear that Harry Wellman's dedication to the University was total. On occasion he would get away for short periods, but it is equally clear that the affairs of the University were always of the greatest import to him. While the University is the stronger for it and the people of California are the ultimate beneficiaries, it is unfortunate that the third generation of agricultural economists were denied the opportunity to share his professional insights and academic values. Perhaps Harry himself regrets, in some measure, having to leave his students and research. He has expressed on more than one occasion since his retirement that he wished he had taken more sabbaticals and could have kept up with his own field of scholarship.
It is comforting to know that Harry's gifts have not gone unapplauded. He has been accorded honorary degrees not only by the Universities of Wisconsin and Oregon State, but also by the University of California. The central building in the agricultural complex on the Berkeley campus is now named Wellman Hall. The Davis campus named for him what many call its most beautiful building. In 1968, he and Ruth were accorded an enthusiastically affectionate and spontaneous farewell dinner attended by a gathering of academia larger than most of us can remember for such an occasion. Possibly along with Benjamin Ide Wheeler, Robert Gordon Sproul, and Clark Kerr, Harry Wellman can be said to have earned the respect, admiration and gratitude of the University of California in unparalleled measure.

A reading of this history of the man will provide an insightful understanding of the achievements and problems of a University, the nature of public higher education, and the quality and character of academicians, especially those of the University of California. One observes that Harry gives fulsome praise to his peers, to their strengths and their achievements. What the reader may miss are the subtler contributions of Harry Wellman himself. Hopefully, we have provided some insight into those contributions beyond what Harry's characteristic modesty would convey.

Through his scholarly studies as an agricultural economist, he has added generally to the world's store of knowledge and specifically to the development of the California agricultural industry.

Through his services as a faculty member, he has enhanced the knowledge and careers of many students, each of whom must to some degree bear the imprint of a particularly gifted teacher.

Through his vigorous work in administrative positions, he has been a major force in the development of a finer University of California.

Through his warmth and wisdom, he has built a host of friends whose respect for and good feelings toward Harry continue to grow.

It is a privilege to have this opportunity, on behalf of all those friends, to thank and salute a most remarkable man.

Chester O. McCorkle, Jr.
Vice President of the University

Herman T. Spieth
Professor Emeritus, Zoology
University of California at Davis

4 October 1976
Berkeley, California
Agriculture, California's leading industry, has been one of the major topics for oral history interviews of the Regional Oral History Office. To document, at first hand, the close relationship between California agriculture and the University of California, this Office had earlier taped the memoirs of Claude Hutchison, one-time dean of the College of Agriculture, and Frank Adams, and Henry Erdman, long-time faculty members in the Department of Agricultural Economics.

Thus, when in 1972, the college was contacted about sponsoring an oral history with Harry R. Wellman, a professor and administrator with some fifty years of active association with the University, some thirty-five of them in the College of Agriculture, the response was agreeably in the affirmative. Vice-President--Agricultural Sciences, James B. Kendrick, and David A. Clarke, Jr., director of the Giannini Foundation, formed a joint venture for the purpose of funding the project which was designed to cover Harry Wellman's entire career with the University--from his years as a graduate student in agricultural economics (1922-1925) through to his year as acting president of the University (1967), and to include whatever he had done after his retirement in 1968.

On June 26, 1972, Dr. Wellman and I met in his office in Giannini Hall to consider the topics which should be covered. He had already carefully outlined eight interview sessions, and although the eight eventually stretched to thirteen because some material was probed in greater depth than originally planned, the basic outline needed very little revision, and it is reflected in the manuscript's table of contents.

Taping began in Dr. Wellman's office, but the acoustics were not good there, and so after a few sessions we transferred to the office of Henry Erdman, who graciously gave up his on-going work during the mornings scheduled for interviews. These were held generally at weekly intervals broken only when the Wellmans were traveling, or when Dr. Wellman wanted additional time to research a topic under discussion. The thirteen meetings spanned nearly two years. In 1972: July 24, 31; August 7, 28; October 30; November 13, 20. In 1973: February 5, 12, 22; March 5, 19; April 9.

Dr. Wellman received his edited transcript on May 9, 1974, and, as he has explained in Chapter IX, being dissatisfied with the results, he rewrote the manuscript. Although he says that he had not prepared well for the interviews he had done some research in advance; in fact we covered some of the ground twice in order that he could provide greater detail. All things are relative; it is doubtful that Harry Wellman ever works on an important task unprepared.
As a result of the rewriting, however, this manuscript is shorter and tighter in construction than the original transcript because Dr. Wellman has managed successfully to bring together topics which had been discussed several times under different contexts, one of the problems in trying to cover the history of the University from several angles.

Some of the interviews have been retained much the same way as they were recorded. Understandably, some of the material of a rather sensitive nature has been deleted. But in rewriting, Dr. Wellman did not lose sight of the purpose of the oral history—to provide the observations of a participant of significant events in University history. By going back into the records, by probing his own and the memories of his colleagues, and by adding pertinent details, he has enriched the document, and therefore its research potential, and at the same time produced an eminently readable and interesting personal memoir.

What is missing from the manuscript, as it often is once the spoken word has been committed to type, is the way in which Dr. Wellman talked about his experience. A serious, quiet, relatively soft-spoken man, not noticeably given to great swings of emotion, he frequently emphasized a point by slapping the desk with a few sheets of rolled-up paper. That gesture, and the chuckles, the occasional laughter, the measured pauses, and the changes in the tone of voice were picked up by the tape recorder and noted in the original transcript. These are not, of course, in the rewritten volume. But what could not be recorded at all was the infectious grin that Dr. Wellman would frequently beam toward the interviewer, which clinched a point better than words alone. His family and colleagues, undoubtedly know and appreciate that grin. The sense of humor which produces it may have helped Harry Wellman through the many prodigious tasks he has accomplished during his successful career, not the least of which was the rewriting of his thirteen interview sessions. Because so much of the transcript was revised, Dr. Wellman requested that only two of the thirteen tapes be retained by The Bancroft Library in the tape center.

Research for the interviews came from several sources. In Giannini Library, Dr. Wellman placed temporarily for my use, his two large scrapbooks full of pictures and news-clippings, dating from 1930. These books, well-kept through the years by Mrs. Wellman, gave me quite a bit of information. So did many of Dr. Wellman's publications written when he was doing research and writing for the Agricultural Extension Service and the Department of Agricultural Economics. For the sixteen years during which he served as vice-president under Robert Gordon Sproul and Clark Kerr, I relied on Verne Stadtman's University of California, 1869-1968, and on conversations with seven of Dr. Wellman's former associates, each of whom devoted time and careful thought to helping me understand Harry
Wellman's contributions to the University. Without their help I would have missed some important links in the story, and I want now to express my appreciation to professors and administrators George Alcorn, Loren Furtado, Sidney Hoos, Clark Kerr, Frank Kidner, Eugene Lee, and Verne Stadtman.

One other person who contributed a considerable amount of time and expert skill to this project and who surely deserves my thanks is Evelyn Spieth (Mrs. Herman) who carefully edited Dr. Wellman's rewritten manuscript and, in notes to him accompanying the returned edited chapters, encouraged him to add some of the human interest stories he was wont to omit. She indirectly, therefore, provided incentive to insist that Dr. Wellman come forth with the last chapter on his post-retirement activities, some of which we had already discussed during the final interview session.

Dr. Wellman and I had one last conference on June 3, 1976 to select photographs and to go over the draft of Chapter IX. For him this was the end of a four-year project attended by unexpected yet admittedly worthwhile effort. He stood outside his office door, smiled broadly, and shook my hand, understandably relieved to think that he was seeing the last of me, insofar as I represented that seemingly unending responsibility—his oral history. As he said to me that day and wrote in Chapter IX, "If I had known in advance how much time and work this history would take, I doubt that I would have agreed to undertake it. But now that it is virtually completed, I am glad that I did."

Malca Chall
Interviewer-Editor

21 June 1976
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FAMILY BACKGROUND, EDUCATION, AND EARLY WORK EXPERIENCES

Harry Wellman's First Years: Mountain View, Alberta to Umapine, Oregon

Chall: Let's start with your background.

Wellman: What I say about my early background is obviously based upon family conversations and records. I was born in Mountain View, Alberta, Canada, on March 4, 1899. My twin brother was born seven minutes earlier, or so I'm told. He was named Richard Harrison after my father. I was named Harrison Richard. When I joined the Navy in World War I, I shortened my name to Harry because it was quicker to write.

Chall: I wondered about the Harry.

Wellman: My twin and I followed six children--two brothers and four sisters. I am told that we were not greeted with much enthusiasm by our brothers and sisters. They felt that six children were enough in the family and eight were too many. What my mother and father thought has not been recorded.

I do not recall my mother. Her first name was Jennie; her maiden name was Woods. She died when I was one year old. At that time, the ages of my brothers and sisters were as follows: Charlie, 14; Bessie (Mary Elizabeth), 12; Emma, 11; Eoline, 9; John, 6; and Jennie, 3.

Chall: This was at the time of your mother's death?

Wellman: Yes. At the turn of the century, Mountain View was a small village with a general store, a post office, a blacksmith shop, a hotel, and a livery stable. There were also two churches--a
Mormon church and a Presbyterian church. School was first held in the Presbyterian church and later, when the Mormon church was built, school was held in it. There was a graveyard on a small hill above the town. Mormons were buried on one side of the fence and gentiles on the other side. The school--there were about eighty children in the school at that time and one teacher. Mountain View was the stopping place between Cardston (the nearest railroad point) and Watertown Park--twelve miles to the west; Cardston was seventeen miles to the east.

We lived in the only frame house in the village. Dad had come there in 1896; as soon as he could, he built the house in Mountain View. There were three rooms upstairs and two rooms downstairs. There was also a large log cabin adjoining, with a kitchen, a dining room, and a storage room.

The neighbors thought that only a log cabin would be warm enough in the wintertime, and that's the reason all the homes except ours were log cabins.

Why did your father build a frame house?

It was easier to build; and being insulated with tar paper, it could be kept as warm as a log house even when the temperature dropped to 30° and 40° below zero, which it sometimes did.

When my mother died, her sister Emma came to Mountain View and took the seven youngest children back with her to Augusta, Montana, to live with her and mother's parents, John G. Woods and Emily Dicken Woods. The oldest brother, Charlie, stayed with Dad. That fall the three older girls insisted on going back to Canada.

Bessie, Emma, and?

Bessie, Emma, and Eoline. Jennie stayed in Montana.

She would have been pretty small then.

Yes, small.

Jennie, Richard, and I were born in Canada. The other children were born in Montana.

Where did your father come from?
Wellman: He had ranched near Augusta, Montana, before moving to Canada. The summer he was nineteen years old or maybe twenty years old he had helped drive a band of sheep from Walla Walla, Washington, to Augusta, Montana. The band of sheep was owned by a young man named Dewitt Holbrook from the East, with wealthy parents. Three years later he married my father's youngest sister Mary and, in so doing, he was disowned and disinherited by his parents.

Chall: Is that so? Was there a religious difference?

Wellman: No, nothing like that; marrying into a poor western family at that time just wasn't done by a rich eastern family.

My father stayed in Montana (or he may have gone back to Walla Walla and then returned to Montana) and started to raise sheep. He later switched to cattle. In 1896 he sold his Montana ranch and took his family and cattle across the Canadian line to Mountain View because there was free rangeland. The government owned the land, and the ranchers could graze their cattle on it without cost. Also, they could cut meadow hay for winter feed. Dad took out a homestead about four miles from Mountain View. It became the center of his cattle operations.

Chall: Did they raise sheep too?

Wellman: No, the Mountain View area was a better cattle than sheep country.

Dad remarried in July, 1901, a young widow named Nettie Rickert who had a daughter, Viva, the same age as Jennie. Nettie was from Michigan but had come to Canada on a visit. She was twenty-two years old; Dad was eighteen years older. I often wondered why she would take on eight stepchildren at her age, but she did.

Chall: She took all of you?

Wellman: Yes, everyone.

The fall after they were married, Dad took his new bride to Walla Walla, Washington, to show her off to his parents and brothers and sisters. Jennie and Viva went with them. Bessie also went along as she was to enter high school in Walla Walla.

On their way home, they stopped in Augusta, Montana, to pick up the twins and, I believe also, John. This was around the first of December. Between Augusta and Mountain View (just where
Wellman: I don't know, they stopped at a hotel where there had recently been cases of both scarlet fever and diptheria. Jennie, Richard, and I came down with diptheria; Viva and John didn't. At the end of December, both Jennie and Richard died. Then my sisters, Emma and Eoline, came down with scarlet fever. They had taken the entire care of Jennie, Richard, and me and must have caught scarlet fever from one of us.

My mother, apparently before she died, had gotten my father to promise that the children would be educated.

My stepmother wanted to leave Canada after seeing the Walla Walla valley. So, in June, 1902, we moved to Umapine, Oregon, just across the Oregon-Washington line, twelve miles southwest of Walla Walla and eight miles northwest of Milton-Freewater.

Chall: That's Umapine?

Wellman: It's an Indian name.

Chall: What was your father planning to do there?

Wellman: He developed a general farm; he bought a section of land--640 acres. My stepmother had been left some money by her first husband which she used to buy an additional 160 acres. Almost all of it was dry land, and it was quite cheap. He developed irrigation for much of the acreage; and from time to time he sold off parcels to pay off the debt he had acquired in purchasing the section. He ended up with over two hundred acres, mostly irrigated, fully equipped and stocked, along with a new house and a new barn, all free of debt. Like most farmers in the area, his annual income was small. He made his money from the increase in land values.

Chall: He developed the irrigation?

Wellman: Yes, in cooperation with several of the neighbors.
The Wellman Family: To Walla Walla Over the Oregon Trail, 1863

Wellman: Let me go back and tell you how my father first got to the Walla Walla valley. He came out from Missouri with his parents in 1863 by ox team and wagon over the Oregon Trail. They left Hannibal, Missouri, in April and arrived in Walla Walla in October. He was two years old at the time; his older brother was six and his older sister was four.

Just why Grandfather and Grandmother Wellman decided to come West I do not know. I wish I did. There was much turmoil and lawlessness in Missouri during the Civil War and that could have influenced them. In any event they exchanged a life of ease and luxury for one of hardship and near poverty, but I'm sure that wasn't their intention or expectation. During the first eight years of their married life, they had lived on his father's farm surrounded by slaves who did all the manual work, both in the house and in the fields.

From 1876 until a few years before they died in 1916, they lived on a farm in the Eureka Flat, about thirty-five miles north of Walla Walla (post office, Clyde). It was a desolate area with little rainfall—hot and dusty in the summer and cold and windy in the winter. Water for both household and farm use had to be brought in by train in tank cars or hauled in a tank wagon from several miles away. The yield of wheat per acre in that area was so low due to the scant rainfall that, even on a 640-acre farm, my grandparents eked out only a bare living.

When they moved to the Eureka Flat they had six children ranging in age from eight to twenty years; their youngest child was born the next year. Many years later one of my cousins made a good living growing wheat in that area, but he farmed around four thousand acres with power-driven equipment.

Life on the Farm: General Chores and Paid Labor

Wellman: When I went to grammar school in Umapine, it was a two-room school. It was on one corner of the crossroads; the other corners were occupied by a store, a church, and a blacksmith shop.
Dear Mark,

I received your letter asking me to advise you in regard to your intended marriage, and also to pass an opinion on your intended wife. In answer to the first question I will say that I approve of early marriages, especially when one proceeds carefully, as you seem to be doing. The second question however is a harder one. In fact it would be a hard question to pass on, if I could see the young lady in person, and to form an opinion from a mere portraiture, might not only do the young lady a great injustice, but disgrace my manhood. Your acquaintance with the lady has been amply sufficient to form a correct opinion. If she be ambitious at all times to appear well intellectually and personally and at the same time thinks everybody smarter and prettier than herself, it is a good omen. If she believes herself to be the most fortunate girl on earth, in having you for a sweetheart, you are fortunate indeed. Be careful then that no act of yours shall ever, make her good opinion undeserved. The first great and important question to consider in selecting a wife, is first does she think you are brave, second does she think you are smart, third does she think you are handsome fourth does she think you are good. If your wife loves you she will think you are all of these, and more too. But remember a woman cant love a coward, a fool, a hedious fright nor a villian. That is if she be a true woman. On the other hand a man can't love a dowdy, a shrew, a coquette nor the devil. The first will make him ashamed of his home, the second will make him shun his home, the third will make him curse his home and the fourth makes home Hell, of course. For as home is where the heart is so also Hell
is where the devil is. After you are married, let your wife know that you are the head of the family, and as such, are entitled to due consideration and respect. Advise with her in all things, but be firm in your own convictions. Never deceive her, nor allow yourself to be deceived. If you find your wife is deceiving you in small affairs, you may rest assured she will deceive you in great affairs. It is better to quarrel than to sulk, but a separation is better than either if the union is without issue. But should there be issue before the quarrel commences, hide your shame as best you can, and bow your head to the inevitable. I hope and pray that your union may prove a happy one, that your wife may love you with an undying love, that she may feel proud of your every advancement, that through her loving officioses, your life may be prosperous, honorable, a delightful dream. If you are a man you will respond to every smile of encouragement, to every word of sympathy, to every tear of sorrow. For know ye, If anchored safely in a wife's great love, you are strongly armored to fight the battles of life, and may laugh at destiny. With a father's blessing I resign you to your fate, feeling confident you will prove true to your wife, true to your manhood, true to your God.

Your Father

A. C. Wellman
HISTORY OF JOHN C. WOODS

John C. Woods is one of the venerable and honored residents of Lewis and Clark County, where he has resided for nearly a score of years, devoting his attention to farming and stock raising, but having retired from the more active pursuits of life, he has given the management of his ranch properties to his sons, capable young businessmen. Mr. Woods was born in Howard County, Missouri on Sept. 4, 1818--the son of Adam C. and Elizabeth Woods, natives of Kentucky. The father went to Missouri in 1816, and being favorably impressed, took up his permanent abode there two years later and engaged in farming and stockraising, continuing therein until the time of his death, which occurred on Aug. 7, 1849. In politics he was an old time Whig, fraternally was a master-mason, and in religion both he and his wife were members of the Christian Church, living useful and exemplary lives, in harmony with the faith which they professed.

The death of our subjects mother occured May 26, 1856.

John C. Woods grew up under the invigorating life of the farm, and his schooling was such as was afforded in the very primitive institutions of learning of the period. He attended the schools during the winter months while in the summer his time was demanded in the work of the farm. At the age of 20 years he assumed charge of the homestead farm, his father being in impaired health, and in the meanwhile he purchased 160 acres devoting his attention to the operation of the same until 1852, when he disposed of the property and purchased 320 acres, paying therefore $4800.00. He successfully engaged in farming and stockgrowing until 1865, when he rented the place on shares and went into the mercantile business in which his success was only nominal. He disposed of this in 1869, resumed farming and continued to be identified with that industry in Missouri until 1883, and then came to Montana. He rented a ranch of a 160 acres, located 8 miles north of the village of Augusta, Lewis and Clark county, which has since been his home and field of industry. Securing good crops the first two seasons, he met with poor returns the third, owing to the drought of that year. In 1884 he took up claims in the same locality and has since added to the area of his estate until he now has 800 acres, of which 200 are available for cultivation. He raised good crops for 6 years, when the scarcity of water rendered it inexpedient to continue the raising of grain and the ranch has since been given over to the raising of cattle, the average maintained being about 200 head, while excellent crops of hay have been secured each year.

In politics Mr. Wood gives allegiance to the Democratic Party; fraternally he is a Royal Arch Mason. All of his sons support the democratic party. On Feb. 23, 1848, Mr. Woods was married to Miss Anna E. Haston, who was born in Missouri, the
daughter of Jesse Haston, who emigrated from Kentucky to Missouri in early years, where he was engaged in farming until the outbreak of the Civil War period in which he met his death in the spring of 1864, by a bullet fired by a member of the Federal State Militia while Mr. Haston was returning from a visit to the Union headquarters. Of this union one child was born, Anna E.. Mrs. Woods died on Dec. 15, 1849, and on Jan. 23, 1851 Mr. Woods consumated a second marriage, being then united to Miss Emilie J. Dicken, who was born in Missouri, the daughter of Richard and Jane Dicken, natives of Kentucky, whence they moved to Missouri in 1825, her father there engaging in agricultural pursuits until his death which occurred there in 1869. His widow survived him until 1879. She was a zealous member of the Christian Church to which Mr. and Mrs. Woods also belong.

Of the six children of our subject and his estimable wife five are living, the one deceased being Jennie, who became the wife of R. H. Wellman and whose death occurred Feb. 18, 1900. The other children are Arthur, Lizzie, Emma, John C., Jr., and William P. Woods.

Mr. Woods has one of the finest ranches in this section of Montana and here he and his faithful wife are passing the twilight of life surrounded by all the comforts afforded by the results of industrious and useful lives.

Jennie Woods was Harry Wellman's mother.
Wellman: I don't recall much that happened in grammar school except that the principal, a man named Kyle Daniels, was a strict disciplinarian. Dad used to say that if any of the children got whipped at school, he would whip them again at home. Well, I never got whipped at school, and Dad never whipped me at home for that or any other reason. I don't think he ever laid a hand on the children. I suspect that my mother, when she was living, was the disciplinarian of the family. My stepmother tried to be but, as you might expect, was not too successful. She was too near the age of her older stepchildren--only seven years older than Charlie and only nine years older than Bessie.

Chall: It was not unusual at that time for very young women to marry older men.

Wellman: Well I don't blame either one of them. Dad was left with eight children and along came this pretty young widow. He was ready to fall, but why she took on the job--I admire her courage but not her judgment. [Laughter]

We lived about a mile and a quarter from school with dirt roads. I rode a bicycle when the roads were dry and walked when they were wet--mud or snow. Viva did the same.

I can recall many interesting things apart from school: July 4th picnics in Umapine; circuses in Walla Walla, leaving very early in the morning in order to get there in time to see the parade; swimming in the big irrigation ditch; my first ride in an automobile--a 1905 model owned by a man named Burlingame; and my first very own horse--a two-year old gelding which I broke to ride. I could go on almost indefinitely.

A boy raised on a general-type farm never lacks for chores to do; and quite naturally, as he grows older, the more chores he has to do. I don't remember when I first started to help bring in wood (the woodbox always seemed to need filling), feed the chickens, gather the eggs, and weed the garden. I was around ten when I started to help milk the cows, separate the milk, feed the calves and pigs, go after the horses, and so on.

About that time, I started to help with haying. I drove derrick when the hay was being stacked. Dad didn't pay me any money for it; the neighbors, of course, did when I worked for them--ten cents an hour for about a ten-hour day plus dinner at noon.
Wellman: Dad never paid me wages for any of the farm work I did at home, and I doubt that he did to any of the other children. During the summers of 1915 and 1916, I did the same work as the hired farm hands, yet I received no wages nor did I expect to. How many days I worked on our farm those summers I don't recall, but it must have been quite a few. When I went to college in the fall of 1916, Dad regularly sent me $25 a month. The cost of board and room in our fraternity house that year was a bit less.

Chall: Were you a pretty serious young boy?

Wellman: No, not particularly. Only in one respect. As far as I can remember, I was set on going to college. My brother John claims that Dad encouraged me in this because I was too lazy to make a good farmer. Well, I don't admit to that, but it is true that I didn't want to be a farmer. John never wanted to be anything else. He could hardly wait to finish the eighth grade before taking off for Mountain View (Canada) to work as a cowboy. He became a successful cattle rancher, well known and highly respected throughout Alberta.

I was the first one in our family to go to college. Later my half sister Marjorie and my half brother Wayne graduated from college. Wayne went on to get a Ph.D. in sociology. Charlie went two years to high school and two years to business college. Emma and Eoline graduated from high school and went directly to teaching in rural schools.

Bessie died shortly after we moved to Umapine. One of my earliest memories was seeing a casket being loaded into a beautifully made hearse drawn by a team of matched black horses. I was four years old at the time.

My stepsister Viva was two years older than I was. I had to take her to dances when I was still in grammar school, and I didn't care much for it. I wasn't a bit interested in dancing at that time. It was a "pain in the neck" to sit around while she danced and to have to stay up to midnight or after especially since I had to get up early the next morning and help with the milking while she could stay in bed. But, on the whole, we got along quite well--no more than the usual brother and sister quarrels.

Getting back now to farming. We had hired men during harvest time made up partly of neighbors who exchanged work with
Wellman: us and partly of migrant workers who went from farm to farm. They were single men carrying their own blankets. We called them hoboes. We also had most of the time a year-around farm hand, sometimes a neighbor's son, and sometimes a hobo who wanted to stay put for awhile. I remember one such man—a good worker, a fairly well-educated man, and a nice person—but he went on a big drunk about twice a year. Then he'd come back, sober up, and swear off for another five or six months.

Chall: What about food? Did you raise much of it?

Wellman: Yes, we raised most of our own food except, of course, sugar and flour. We raised some wheat but didn't have it ground for our own use. We always had a big vegetable garden and a home orchard. We canned a lot of fruit, but no vegetables—too much danger from botulism. There were no pressure cookers at that time. The only fruit that I can remember we bought were oranges at Christmas.

As for meat, we butchered ten to twelve hogs each winter. They weighed 150-200 pounds. It was a nice sight to see a dozen hogs hanging in a row on a pole, all pink and white after they'd been scalded, scraped, and dressed. Also, we'd butcher one or two six to seven-month-old calves during the year and three or four wethers.

Chall: Oh, I've never heard of that term.

Wellman: A wether is a male sheep that was castrated when it was a lamb. Calves and wethers would usually be butchered during haying, and we'd hang them high in a tree to protect them from any varmints.

Chall: What products did you raise?

Wellman: Alfalfa hay was the main crop. Most of it was fed on the farm to cows, horses, and sheep. Any extra was sold. We milked around twenty cows—the cow side of our new barn had room for twenty cows and Dad believed in keeping it full. Then we had calves and always kept a bull. The male calves were sold and most of the heifer calves kept for replacement. We had around fifteen to twenty horses and colts, around forty breeding sheep, and five or six sows and their pigs. We also grew some wheat and barley.
Wellman: I never saw a copy of Dad's farm records, but I suppose that he kept some. My best guess after the lapse of many years is that his cash income was mainly from the sale of cream, grain, sheep, and wool. Of less importance was the sale of horses, calves, pigs, and alfalfa.

In the spring of 1913, Dad rented the farm. The tenant lived in the old house that had been moved about a quarter of a mile away when the new house was built. That summer I worked as chore boy for Emma's husband, Hans Clodius, on their wheat ranch near Mayview, Washington. The work was much the same as I would have been doing at home. The chief difference was that I was paid in cash for working for Hans, as I recall, $30 a month and, of course, room and meals.

That was a pleasant summer. The highlight for me was getting to drive Han's Studebaker automobile to deliver sacks to the combine when they ran out of them unexpectedly. Unfortunately, from my standpoint, that happened only two or three times during the season.

During the first part of the summer of 1914, I worked for neighbors, mainly in haying. During the latter part I worked on a stationary threshing outfit which went from farm to farm to thresh wheat and barley that had already been cut and stacked. My job was driving derrick. I got $2.50 a day and meals but not bedding. The crew provided their own bedrools and slept on the grain stacks.

Driving derrick consisted of driving a two-horse team to pull the unthreshed grain by means of a fork about four-feet wide from the stack to the thresher platform. Up and back, up and back, from twenty feet to one hundred feet all day long. Going forward was easy; the hard work was backing the team up, pulling on the reins, and carrying the doubletree which weighed around fifteen pounds--fifteen pounds in the morning and fifty pounds, or so it seemed, by the end of the day.

Chall: Doubletree?

Wellman: Doubletree, a hitch for a two-horse team, singletree, a hitch for one horse. In about an hour after the start of a new setting, the dust would be one to two inches deep; and by the end of the run on that farm the dust would be six to eight inches deep.

We worked from daylight till dark and sometimes longer. The whistle on the steam engine was blown at 4:00 a.m. to awaken the
Wellman: The fireman had gotten up a half hour earlier to get up enough steam to start threshing by 4:30 a.m. We drivers (there were two of us) had to get our teams harnessed, watered, and hitched up by that time. Then we worked for an hour and a half before breakfast, took thirty minutes off for breakfast; worked until 12:00 noon, took off an hour for dinner; worked until 6:00 p.m., took off thirty minutes for supper; and worked until 8:00 p.m. After that, we drivers had to unharness, water, feed, and curry our two horses.

Chall: I should think you would be exhausted.

Wellman: I certainly was, and I'm sure the other members of the crew were, too. Getting to sleep at night was no problem; getting up in the morning--that was different.

We worked six days a week. On Saturday nights after work, the other driver (a neighbor's boy two years older than I was) and I rode his horses home. A bath and a long sleep; then back to the threshing machine Sunday evening.

Water at the threshing machine sites was scarce. It had to be hauled in. Water for the steam engine, water for drinking by men and horses, and water for cooking all took a higher priority than water for washing. While we had water for washing our hands and face before meals, we didn't have any for bathing at night. I must admit that that did not seem to me to be any great sacrifice at the time, even though I had walked in ankle-deep dust for hours.

The family moved to Walla Walla that fall (1914). When I got to the folks' new home after the threshing was over, I learned that war had broken out in Europe. That didn't seem important to me at the time or for months to come.

Chall: How many weeks did the threshing go on?

Wellman: We were out thirty-nine working days.

Chall: That's hard work.

Wellman: That was very hard work. It was altogether too hard for a youngster of my age.
High School: Umapine and Walla Walla

Chall: How about high school?

Wellman: I started high school at Umapine in the fall of 1913. About two years before that, they'd built a new school--a two-story brick building. The high school was in the upper story and the grammar school in the lower story.

My first year in high school must have been an uneventful one. I don't remember much about it except that I had to take Latin. My second high school year was in Walla Walla.

Chall: Why did your folks move to Walla Walla?

Wellman: My stepmother wanted to live in town; Dad having rented the farm had no good reason to refuse. By that time, they could afford to live in town. So they rented a house in Walla Walla, took along a cow and some chickens, and settled in.

In my class in Walla Walla High School were Robert Brode, now Professor of Physics Emeritus at Berkeley; Ralph Cordiner who became president of the General Electric Company; and Eugene Woodruff who became a rather famous physician. Bob Brode was a triplet (three boys). His father was professor of mathematics at Whitman College in Walla Walla. Ralph Cordiner's family was poor. Eugene Woodruff's family was well-to-do. I didn't know Bob Brode or his brothers while in high school; I did run around quite a bit with Ralph Cordiner and Eugene Woodruff.

In the spring of 1915, in April or early May, the renter left (why I don't recall), and we moved back to the farm. Dad and I each milked ten cows night and morning. I still attended high school in Walla Walla. After milking and breakfast in the morning, I drove four miles by horse and buggy, rode five miles on an interurban train, and walked one mile. In the afternoon, just the reverse. Apparently, the schedule didn't hurt me. At least my grades didn't suffer. I got all A's.

Chall: Did you continue in Walla Walla High School?

Wellman: No. I returned to Umapine except for a course in mechanical drawing which I took in Walla Walla. I went to Walla Walla once a week but did most of the work at home. I found that, by taking
Wellman: an extra course at Umapine as well as the course at Walla Walla, I could graduate in three years; so I did. I suspect that the prestige of being a senior rather than thirst for knowledge was the main incentive.

That year at Umapine High School was most enjoyable.

Chall: Why was that?

Wellman: Well, for one thing, I discovered that girls were nice to be with and that dancing was fun. Then, too, I liked being 'a big frog' even if in a tiny puddle. I was a top student, a member of the baseball team, a member of the debating team, had the leading role in the high school play, and was manager of the high school annual.

We were the second class to graduate from the high school at Umapine (at that time, it was called Vincent High School). There were six of us. The first class had three students in it. Here's the senior class picture [shows Mrs. Chall class picture in the Cynosure, the Vincent High School Annual, Vol. 1].

Chall: One girl?

Wellman: One girl and five boys.

We students were proud of the annual; it's really quite a nice little book.

Chall: My, this is really a classic. How did you choose the name Cynosure?

Wellman: It was suggested by one of our teachers, Frank Dietsch. He also suggested that the name of the high school be changed from Vincent to Umapine. He felt the high school and the crossroads should have an Indian name.

There is a picture of him in the annual. Here it is; quite a young man [looking at Dietsch's picture]. He wasn't the principal; a man named Sevy was. But Dietsch is the one I remember best.

Chall: Was that because he had a strong personality?

Wellman: No. He was interested in the students. He did extra things—he coached the debating team, he directed the school play, and he was the guiding spirit in our getting out the annual.
Chall: What classes did you like in high school? Were you interested in anything in particular?

Wellman: Yes, I liked mathematics, I think, the best of the classes in high school. I liked algebra and also geometry which I took in Walla Walla High School. I particularly liked the neat solutions in algebra and geometry.

Dad bought his first automobile in 1914—a Studebaker touring car. I was occasionally allowed to drive it. But my main transportation was still a horse and buggy. I drove about the best-looking trotting horse around there. Dad always loved good horses. As a young man in Montana, he owned a race horse named Redbird and won quite a few bets on him. In Umapine he raised purebred Clydesdale horses, more I suspect from love of them than from any income they brought in.

Oregon Agricultural College, Corvallis, 1916-1921

Wellman: During that year, 1915-16, the community cow tester, who went from farm to farm testing the butter content of the owner's cows, was a young man named Howard Belton, who later became treasurer of the state of Oregon. He had recently graduated from Oregon Agricultural College. I got quite well acquainted with him. Also, Frank Dietsch, my favorite high school teacher, was an OAC graduate. They had a good deal to do with my going to Corvallis rather than to Washington Agricultural College at Pullman which was closer to home.

So, in September, 1916, I boarded a train at Freewater and headed for Corvallis; I had to change trains at Pendleton and again at Portland. I had never been so far from home before. The only incidents that I can recall was (1) being waved at by two ladies from a second-story window while walking uptown from the railroad depot in Portland (while I knew all about the birds and the bees as far as farm animals were concerned I didn't connect that knowledge to the two ladies waving to me from the window; I simply waved back and walked on), and (2) the failure of the delivery man at the railroad station in Corvallis to deliver my trunk containing all my clothes, except those I was wearing, to the rooming house where I was to stay, and finding it a week later in the top story of a girls' dormitory. You can imagine how happy I was to get that trunk back.
Wellman: Before I left home, I had decided to major in mechanical engineering—not that I knew what courses I would have to take or the outlook for jobs when I graduated. But I was quite sure that I didn't want to take agriculture; at that time, agriculture to me meant farming.

A Sunday or two after I arrived in Corvallis, I attended an Epworth League service. There I met two brothers, Conner and Homer Edwards, who invited me to luncheon at their local fraternity house, the Oxford Club. Some weeks later, I was invited to join and I did. There began an association that contributed much to my success and enjoyment in college and which I treasure to this day.

As early as 1916, the Oxford Club had set the tone of the club and of its successor, the Oregon Alpha Chapter of Sigma Phi Epsilon, which was maintained during the time I was in college and for many years thereafter, perhaps even to this day: high scholarship, good morals, and a home away from home. The establishment of those characteristics and their perpetuation were due very largely to one man, U.G. Dubach, professor of government, and, later in his career, Dean of Men. He had great influence on me, although I never took a course from him. As faculty advisor and member of our house, Dr. Dubach was a second father to us—a stern father when we got out of line and a pleased father when we did our best. Most of us, I suspect, did a little better than we otherwise would have done just to please him. I know I did.

Dubach was a remarkable man. His influence extended far beyond our fraternity house. It was campus-wide and beyond, and it continued year after year throughout his long life. He regularly spoke at numerous high schools from one end of Oregon to the other. It is, I think, fair to say that Dr. Dubach touched more Oregon youth than any other person of his generation.

When I was in college, every freshman had to take a course on how to use the library. It met once a week. At the second or third class meeting, I saw a beautiful girl come through the door, but she sat too far away for me to hear her name when the attendance roll was called. The next week I waited outside until she arrived, followed her in and sat directly behind her. This time I got her name. It was Ruth Gay. That evening I telephoned her and asked for a date. She said she was busy. Each week for the next two months I asked her for a date, and each week I got the same reply. Then I invited her to go with me to our annual
Wellman: fraternity dinner which was held before the Christmas recess.
She said yes. That was our first date. Five years and two months later, we were married.

Chall: How were you as a student in college?

Wellman: Pretty good.

When the grades came out at the end of the first semester of my freshman year, my fraternity brothers were pleased and surprised—I had gotten three A's and three B's. At the end of each semester (or quarter), the grades of each member of our house were posted in a prominent place. During my undergraduate career, I received quite a few more A's than B's and only three C's.

I early learned to do some studying each day, and in this I was encouraged by one of our house rules—all lower division students had to be in their rooms each evening from 7:30 until 10:00, Mondays through Thursdays. Each lower division student was assigned to room with an upper division student. I also learned from the upper division student, George V. Robinson, with whom I roomed in my sophomore year and who was himself a good student, that I could escape the frantic studying for examinations by regularly studying the class assignments, by paying attention in class even to a dull teacher, and by taking rather full notes and by reviewing them while they were still fresh in my mind—not that I always did so; but when I neglected to do so, I almost always regretted it. Another practice which I followed was to study in the daytime when I wasn't in class. It was easy to return to our house between classes since it was just on the edge of the campus, not more than four to five minutes' walking time from the main classroom and laboratory buildings. By studying during my spare hours in the daytime, I could with good conscience sit in on the bull sessions which went on after 10:00 p.m. in someone's room.

My extracurricular activities in college were relatively few. I never held any campus-wide or class office. I did not make any athletic team except class baseball. I had even less musical ability than athletic ability; in fact, I had none, so the glee club, the band, and the orchestra were far beyond my reach. I did not try out for a part in the college plays nor for the debating team. I have always regretted not taking part in college debating. The experience would have stood me in good stead throughout my professional career.
Wellman: In my junior year, I was a member of the staff of the college annual, the Beaver, and in my senior year, I was manager of my fraternity house and president of the association of fraternity managers. I was a member of three honorary societies--Alpha Zeta, Gamma Signa Delta, and Scabbard and Blade--and took part in their activities.

One afternoon in the middle of the second semester of my freshman year, I received a telegram that Dad had had a stroke and I was needed at home. I left immediately. Everybody, including myself, assumed that I would be the working foreman of the farm while Dad was ill. Farm operations had to go on: livestock had to be fed; cows had to be milked, and crops had to be planted, cultivated, and harvested. Both Charlie and John (my older brother) were married and had their own farms to operate.

Dad lived only a few weeks. He died May 17, 1917. He was adored by all of his children. Again, everybody, including myself, assumed that I would stay on the farm until the estate was settled. My stepmother was named executor. She paid me $60 a month with room and board--a good wage at that time. She found a good renter that winter; and when he took over I was free to leave.

After leaving the farm in February, 1918, I made my home with my oldest sister, Emma, and her husband, Hans Clodius. They had moved from their wheat ranch near Mayview to Walla Walla. Eoline lived with them. She was taking care of their invalid son, Wilfred, and she continued to do so until he died.

A young man named Will Kibler very much wanted to marry her, but she refused to leave Wilfred to anyone else's care. Will finally gave up and married another girl. Years later, after both his wife and Wilfred had died, Will and Eoline were married. Eoline was as unselfish a person as I have ever known.

As far as I can recall, I had never had any difficulty with my stepmother, or she with me, but I always thought of her as my stepmother rather than as my mother. So when I returned from the Navy or from college, I went to Emma's. It was a delightful place to go. After Dad's death I thought of Emma as head of the family even though she was two years younger than Charlie. If any of the brothers and sisters deserve the appellation "sterling character," it is Emma. Grandmother Wellman, I have been told, also possessed that quality.

I returned to college at the beginning of the spring semester (February, 1918). I had received about two-thirds credit for the work I had done the previous spring semester and did not have to repeat any of the work I had taken then. I was considered to be a sophomore--a status markedly superior to that of a freshman.
A prominent slogan in early 1918 was "food will win the war." Around the middle of May, college officials announced that any student wishing to leave early to work on a farm could do so and would receive full credit for the semester's work. This seemed to me too good an opportunity to miss, so I took off for Canada to work for brother John on his cattle ranch. He had no idea I was coming. I wanted to see John (his wife had died in 1916, and he was alone), and I wanted to see the place where I was born and about which I had heard so much from Dad and my older brothers and sisters.

I found John on his ranch, the one Dad had homesteaded--four miles from Mountain View. He was "batching." (As I recall, he wasn't any shakes as a cook.) I learned from him that the Canadian government had recently passed a law requiring all males nineteen years of age and older to register for conscription on May 30, only a few days away. Then I recalled that a man who said he was an immigration official had asked me a lot of questions after the train had crossed the Canadian border.

I had come to Canada without a passport or other documents. I told the man how old I was (nineteen), where I had been born (Mountain View), and whom I was going to visit. It seemed to me and also to John that I would have to register for conscription. John was in no danger of being drafted since he was running a ranch growing food. But I had no such escape.

I persuaded John that both he and I should join the Canadian Royal Flying Corps and serve together. Early the next morning, we saddled a couple of horses, rode to Cardston (twenty miles away), caught a train to Lethbridge, and stopped at the recruiting station. There we were given a preliminary physical examination which included being whirled around in a chair. John became dizzy. We were told to come back at 4:30 p.m. and pick up train tickets to Calgary where we would be inducted into the Flying Corps. We were also told that, if we failed the course in flying, we would be transferred to the infantry.

Well, John and I faced a real problem. Neither one of us wanted to end up in the infantry; yet, it was doubtful that John could pass the Air Corps' physical tests. We decided to return to his ranch and try to figure out what to do. I was
Wellman: the vulnerable one. I concluded that I would rather serve in the United States Navy than in the Canadian Royal Flying Corps without John. But how to get back to the United States? John came up with the solution. He got a friend of his, who owned a Chevrolet car, to take me to Babb, Montana. We went by a road that was little more than a cattle trail and which bypassed all the border stations. I caught a stage to Browning, Montana, a train to Spokane, Washington, and enlisted in the United States Navy.

My navy experience was brief and limited. I reported for duty in August and was mustered out in December. My rank when I left was the same as when I entered, Seaman, 2nd class. The only vessels I was on were the ferry boats between Bremerton and Seattle (Washington). A few weeks after getting out of "boot camp," I entered an officers' training school located on the mudflats of Lake Washington adjacent to the University of Washington campus. The armistice came before my class had completed its training. We all got out as soon as we could.

When I returned to college in January, 1919, OAC had shifted from the semester to the quarter calendar. As a student under both calendars, I found little to choose between them. I changed my major from mechanical engineering to farm management, not that I had any intention of seeking a job managing a farm but rather because that major allowed a lot of leeway to take courses in other fields while mechanical engineering did not. I became particularly interested in economics and marketing. This was due in large part to the instructor I had in those subjects, a man by the name of Newell H. Comish. He was not a scholar—I doubt that he ever published anything—but he was an enthusiastic teacher.

In the summer of both 1919 and 1920, I worked on a wheat ranch near Walla Walla. Although I had inherited some land from Dad's estate—seventeen acres—and received a small income from it, I still had to work during the summers to support myself in college. In 1919 I earned $3.50 a day weeding summer fallow before harvest and $5.00 a day tending header on the combine during harvest—meals and a sleeping place included.

Weeding summer fallow was a dirty, lonely job. Standing on a sled-type weeder behind four horses walking over ploughed ground, getting off every one hundred yards or so to dump the accumulated weeds, and being entirely alone was not the most pleasant farm work, but I needed the money. Besides, by doing
Wellman: the summer fallowing, I was sure of a job tending header on the combine during harvest which was easier, cleaner, and paid more. Also, instead of working alone, I was with the four other crew members.

In addition to pretty good food and a fairly clean bunkhouse, that farm had an out-of-doors shower—an overhead sprinkler attached to a raised galvanized tank. The water was heated only by the sun but seldom was too cold. A daily shower before going to bed was a luxury few farm hands enjoyed in those days or perhaps even wanted.

During the first part of the summer of 1920, I attended an ROTC encampment in Camp Kearney near San Diego. The girl I later married was living there with her folks at the time. They had moved to San Diego the summer before, and Ruth had taken a secretarial job instead of returning to OAC. I had more dates with her that summer than I had had altogether in college. I began to think that, when I was ready to get married, I would look no farther. Ruth has never said what she thought.

After ROTC encampment, I returned to Walla Walla and got a job with the same farmer I worked for the summer before—this time driving combine. I had never driven combine before but was confident that I could.

The combine team I drove consisted of thirty-three horses, hitched three in front followed by five rows of six horses each. You guided the three lead horses with two reins; the others were tied to the hitch and to each other and followed along, stimulated by the driver's vocabulary and well-aimed rocks. As the season advanced, both the driver's vocabulary and his aim improved. Fortunately, I had a good lead team—the three horses in front—and had no trouble keeping the twenty-four foot header full into the grain without missing any.

I was paid $7.50 a day, meals and room included. The driver had to take care of nine horses—feed, harness, water them in the morning; water and feed them at noon; and water, unharness, feed, and curry them in the evening. Three other members of the crew took care of eight horses each.

We were hitched up and ready to go as soon as the dew was off the grain, usually around 7:00 a.m., and, except for an
hour's break at noon, continued until about 7:30 in the evening. Driving combine was one of the best farm jobs I ever had.

My senior year was clearly the most enjoyable one. I had become acquainted with most of my professors and took the opportunity to visit with them outside the classroom. I had a rather wide acquaintance on campus, and I had made some very close friends among my fraternity brothers. Ruth was still in San Diego, and I dated quite a few different girls. A fraternity brother, Harold B. Robinson (who later was the "best man" at our wedding), and I set as our goal the dating of every pledge in his sister's sorority. I think we made it.

By the end of the winter quarter of my senior year, I had completed all requirements for graduation. I had no desire to leave then, but I thought it would be a good idea to line up a position for after graduation in June. Somewhere I heard that the Agricultural Extension Service was looking for a county 4-H Club agent. I made an appointment to see the State Leader of 4-H Clubs, Mr. H.C. Seymour, who had an office in Agricultural Hall on campus. After asking me quite a few questions and explaining the nature of the work done by county 4-H Club agents, he offered me a job in Malheur County. The only "fly in the ointment" was that he wanted me to start work immediately.

The time to start 4-H crop and livestock clubs is in the spring--June is too late. I would much rather have waited until June and taken some interesting courses in the spring quarter. But, after some reflection it seemed too good an opportunity to pass up, so I accepted.

On my way to Malheur County, I stopped in Pendleton, Oregon, and became a United States citizen. Congress had passed a law which enabled anyone who had served in the armed forces during World War I to obtain his naturalization papers immediately by appearing before a United States circuit court and taking the oath of allegiance.
Wellman: In 1921 Malheur County was still pretty much a pioneer country. It was large in land area--nearly two hundred miles long and sixty miles wide--but small in population--between eleven thousand and twelve thousand people. The towns were small; the population of the largest town, Ontario, was around two thousand; and the population of the county seat, Vale, was around one thousand. The economy of the county rested almost entirely on agriculture. There was no other industry of any consequence. The towns' people made their living by providing services for the farmers and ranchers and for themselves.

I was the first 4-H Club agent in Malheur County. There had been a few 4-H Clubs before, but not many. My job was to let boys and girls to join the clubs, recruit local leaders--mainly among parents of the youngsters--and train them. Then I followed the progress of the club members during the year, met with them from time to time, and encouraged them to complete their projects. Each club was urged to put on a demonstration at some meeting in the community, and the members were encouraged to exhibit at the county fair.

The boys were mainly in livestock clubs--beef calves, dairy calves, pigs, sheep, and chickens. There was one corn club. The girls were mainly in cooking and sewing clubs.

I spent around four days a week in the field and the other two days in the office. The county furnished me with a Model-T Ford touring car. There were no paved roads outside the three main towns. There were about sixty miles of gravel roads. The rest were dirt roads--some graded, some not.

Chall: That must have been difficult.

Wellman: It was sometimes difficult. The dirt roads were dusty in the summer, slippery in the winter, and always rough. One winter afternoon, I was taking a shortcut from Owyhee to Vale. My car slipped off the road, and, if I had not been able to cut enough sagebrush to put under the wheels and get the car back on the road, I would have had a long cold walk. There was not a house within miles.

Chall: Did you enjoy your work?
Wellman: Oh, I enjoyed it very much. It was really rewarding to work with those farm boys and girls and see them develop. Many of them lived in quite isolated areas; and in club work they were able to get together on common projects.

Chall: They were all farm boys and girls?

Wellman: When I was there, yes.

In June, 1921, I attended the annual state 4-H Club conference in Corvallis and, hence, was able to attend the graduation exercises of my class. Two things happened while I was in Corvallis which had a great influence on my life.

I took several long walks with Professor Comish under whom I had taken courses in economics and marketing and had become much interested in them. He convinced me that I should go on for graduate work. He thought the University of Wisconsin was the best graduate school in the country. He had gotten his Master's degree there.

Marriage

Chall: It did have a great reputation at that time.

Wellman: Oh yes, particularly in agricultural economics—a great reputation.

The second thing that happened was that Ruth came up from San Diego to visit friends, and we became sufficiently interested in each other—to almost, but not quite become engaged. Several months later, after she had returned to San Diego and I had returned to Malheur County, we decided to get married.

Sometime in November or December—I do not remember which—the United States Bank of Vale, in which I had my money, went broke. It had loaned heavily to sheep growers. The price of sheep and wool had dropped drastically, and the bank could not collect its loans. I eventually got back $12.70 from my savings of over $700. I was clearly unable financially to go to San Diego to get married. Ruth solved that problem. She met me far more than halfway as she has done many times since. She
Wellman: came up from San Diego to Portland. I went from Vale to Portland. We were married there at high noon on February 1, 1922.

Chall: Had your wife graduated from college?

Wellman: No, she did not return to Corvallis for her senior year.

Our house in Vale was a five-room brick cottage. It was one block from my office in the county courthouse. The rent was $15 a month, unfurnished. Ruth had worked during the two years she was in San Diego and had saved quite a bit of her earnings. She bought the furniture--mostly used and made the drapes.

Food as well as rent was cheap. Eggs, as I recall, were twelve cents a dozen in the store; and milk was eight cents a quart at a dairy about a half mile from town. Other foods were correspondingly low.

My salary was $150 a month. I had authorization to employ secretarial help on a part-time hourly basis. Ruth was by far a better secretary than any other available person in town, so I hired her. She earned around $25 a month. Thus, our combined income averaged $175 a month. We save about half of it.

By July, we were confident that we would have enough money, come September, to take a year's graduate work at the University of Wisconsin. I wrote to Professor B.H. Hibbard, chairman of the Department of Agricultural Economics, applying for admission and also for a teaching assistantship. He wrote back in due time saying that I was admitted but that the teaching assistant positions had all been filled. He invited me to come on and said that, if a vacancy occurred, I would be considered for it.

Graduate School: University of Wisconsin, 1922

Chall: You went to Wisconsin?

Wellman: Yes. In September we sold our furniture for about as much as we paid for it, packed up, and took the train to Madison. There was a railroad strike on at the time, and the trains were running late. We went by day coach--sitting up three nights--and arrived
in Madison the fourth evening hot and tired. We splurged ourselves to a nice hotel room. The next day we found an apartment, or rather what was called an apartment in a private home—a living room with a two-burner gas plate for cooking (but no sink or running water), a bedroom across the hall, and a bathroom which we shared with the married couple who owned the house. The rent was $40 a month—$5.00 more than the salary of a teaching or research assistant in the University of Wisconsin at that time.

Ruth promptly decided she would get a job, which she did, as a secretary at the Burgess Battery Company. It was clear across town, and it took her an hour on the streetcar each way. She left the apartment around seven o'clock in the morning and returned around six o'clock in the evening. Her salary was $75 a month.

Chall: That must have helped out.

Wellman: It certainly did. After Vale, living costs in Madison were much higher than we had expected.

Just before classes started, Professor Hibbard offered me a job as assistant in agricultural economics—part teaching assistant and part research assistant. I conducted two discussion sections in his lower division course in agricultural economics; and I helped analyze records on how Wisconsin farmers had climbed the agricultural ladder. The generally accepted theory was from hired farm worker to tenant to owner. That was usually the case, but for quite a few the climb had been made much easier and quicker by marrying a well-to-do farmer's daughter. I worked about eighteen to twenty hours a week and was paid the going rate—$35 a month.

Chall: How did agricultural economics of Wisconsin compare to what you had had at Corvallis?

Wellman: Well, I had only had undergraduate courses at Oregon, and at Wisconsin I took graduate courses. They were naturally more advanced. I sat in on Professor Hibbard's lower division course in agricultural economics—the course I was teaching assistant for—and got a good deal out of it, as much or more from conducting discussion sections as from his lectures.

I took advanced agricultural economics under Professor Hibbard, which was mainly on the history of agricultural economic
Wellman: development; a seminar on land problems from Professor Richard T. Ely and Professor Wehrwein; a course in the history of economic doctrine under Professor William A. Scott; and a course in advanced economic theory under Professor William H. Kiekhofe. I was disappointed that I was not able to take any work in agricultural marketing which, after all, was my main interest. Professor Theodore Macklin, the teacher of agricultural marketing, was on leave-of-absence and no one took over his courses.

Chall: Nobody at all teaching marketing?

Wellman: Nobody teaching graduate work in marketing that year. Professor Hibbard was a superb teacher on all counts. In many respects, Henry Erdman takes after him, although Hibbard was a more dynamic lecturer and I think expressed more of a sense of humor in his classes than Erdman did. Otherwise, they were very similar—very comfortable people to be with and work with. They did not try to dictate to you—they tried to stimulate you.

Professor Ely was excellent in seminar and discussion—chock full of ideas. I understand that he was not a good lecturer, but in a seminar he was outstanding.

Professor Scott—his material was highly organized, the most highly organized of any graduate course or seminar I have taken. But it was well presented. He never left the students in doubt as to what he thought. But he was not very receptive to interpretations different from his own. I think most of the students were a bit afraid of him—I know I was.

Chall: This was your first introduction to the history of economics, or had you had something in your classes in Corvallis?

Wellman: I had had elementary economic theory from Professor Comish. We had used Ely's book, The Principles of Economics. But that is as far as I had gone. I had not had anything in the history of economic theory.

Professor Kiekhofe, as I have mentioned, taught a graduate course in current economic theory. He was a dynamic teacher—better as a teacher of undergraduate students than of graduate students. He taught Economics 1A-1B. He was the Ira B. Cross of the University of Wisconsin. After he retired, the University of Wisconsin Alumni Association established a teaching award in
Wellman: his honor. My nephew, Robert L. Clodius, who got both his B.S. degree and his Ph.D. degree in agricultural economics at Berkeley and had joined the faculty of the University of Wisconsin, won it one year.

I think I mentioned that Ruth and I had planned on only one year of graduate work. But when we got to Wisconsin, we found that most of the graduate students there were planning on three to four years and a Ph.D. That was the spirit of the times, and that is what the faculty encouraged. But Ruth and I were not convinced that we wanted to live for several years like we would have to live if I went on for a Ph.D. So after talking the matter over with Professor Hibbard--it was very easy to talk with him--I decided I would stay out for the spring semester.

I got a job working for Standard Oil Company of Indiana in La Crosse, Wisconsin, selling petroleum products to farmers.

As weeks went by, we found ourselves thinking more and more about the advantages of graduate work. Along about May, we decided definitely that I would go on for a Ph.D. The job with Standard Oil was pleasant enough--calling on farmers--having been in the agricultural extension service and having been raised on a farm, I could readily talk the farmers' language. But the work was not stimulating, and it did not seem like what I wanted to do with my future.

Chall: You had been stimulated at Wisconsin?

Wellman: I had been stimulated enough, so I wanted to continue. But we did not go back to Wisconsin. We came to California instead to the University of California in Berkeley.

Graduate School: University of California, 1923-1925

Chall: Why was that?

Wellman: Well, there were several reasons for it. In the first place, Professor Macklin was going to be on leave again at Wisconsin. And I heard--I do not know where, but I think probably from Professor Hibbard, because he kept pretty good track of his graduate students--I had heard that an up and coming young man
Wellman: in marketing, named Henry E. Erdman, had recently moved to the University of California from Ohio. I felt pretty confident that I could get good training in marketing under him. The other reason was that both Ruth and I had been raised in the Far West, and we decided that was where we wanted to live. And then, Ruth's folks were living in San Diego.

Along in the latter part of May, 1923, we bought a Ford Model-T touring car for $450 and started West. Seventeen days later we arrived in Berkeley. The Lincoln Highway was under construction, and we traveled mostly, or so it seemed, on detours. We camped out most of the time to save money.

We reached Davis, California, one afternoon about two o'clock. It was too far to go on to Berkeley, so we camped in the public campgrounds across the railroad tracks from the depot at Davis. I did not know at the time that there was a branch of the University of California there.

Shortly after we arrived in Berkeley, I enrolled in summer session and took a course in economic theory under Professor Wolfe, a visiting professor from Ohio State University. The text was Principle of Economics by Alfred Marshall. I got a good introduction to that classic work. I also audited a course in beginning French. A reading knowledge of two foreign languages was required for the Ph.D. degree. As far as I was concerned, learning to read French and German was a waste of time. I never used them.

Chall: How did you get along with them?

Wellman: Oh, I got along all right, that is, I passed the examinations. Then I immediately forgot what I had learned.

Chall: Too bad, but it was something you had to do.

Wellman: Ruth got a job with the athletic department in Stephens Union. Throughout my graduate years she was my best grant-in-aid. As a fringe benefit, Ruth got a free ticket to the football games—I ushered and also got in free. We saw the first game in the new stadium built in 1923. Since then I have seldom missed a home football game except when I was out of town.

With the opening of the fall semester, I worked with Professor Erdman, taking his graduate seminar in agricultural marketing and also auditing his undergraduate course in
agricultural marketing. Also, that year I took a course in the history of economic thought from Professor Carl C. Plehn; and a course in economic history from Professor Felix Flugel.

Professor Carl C. Plehn was a noted scholar in public finance. Apparently he had been assigned to teach the seminar in the history of economic thought and considered it to be a chore. He would come into the classroom--there were about thirty of us in the class--with his hat on and some books under his arm. He would take his hat off, put it on the corner of his desk, put his books down, and start reading. The course consisted of him reading excerpts from Adam Smith, David Ricardo, John Stuart Mill and others. It did introduce us to many of the older classic in economics.

Chall: He was from the Department of Economics?

Wellman: Yes.

Then I took a course from Henry R. Hatfield, who was a famous professor of accounting. He taught the first course in accounting as well as advanced accounting. I took the course because Professor Erdman insisted I take it. He said, "Look, you cannot do research in marketing without knowing some accounting." He also encouraged me to take an elementary course in statistics under Professor Albert H. Mobray. He said, "Statistics is a tool you are going to have to have. You might as well learn something about it now." And I must say that both of those courses stood me in good stead.

Somewhere--I do not know where--Professor Erdman found the funds to employ me as a research assistant, and I got $60 a month. That was almost twice as much as I got at Wisconsin. In her work with the athletic department, Ruth received $100 a month, and she did not have to spend two hours a day on the streetcar as she had done in Madison. Our combined income was $160 a month--much better than the $110 a month we got at Wisconsin. We had a very nice place to live--a small apartment in a duplex on Cedar street, just east of Euclid--and it was brand new. I think we paid $5.00 a month more than we had paid for very poor accommodations in Madison. We felt we were "living in clover," that is until September 17, 1923, the day of the Berkeley fire.

That afternoon, we were both on campus--Ruth was working in the stadium office in Stephens Union, and I was in Erdman's seminar in Hilgard Hall. We both rushed home as soon as we
Wellman: learned of the seriousness of the fire, and we got there at about the same time.

Chall: That burned down a good portion of the Berkeley homes, did it not?

Wellman: About eight hundred homes burned. When we got home the fire was about two blocks north of Cedar Street--where we lived. It was coming fast, about a block every ten to fifteen minutes. We tried to wet down the roof of the house, but there was no water. It had drained out of the broken pipes in the burning houses above us. So we left, took what we could carry and came down to the campus. That evening we rented an apartment on Dana Street where Harmon Gymnasium now stands.

Chall: Did your house burn?

Wellman: Oh yes, the house burned completely. It was one of the eight hundred houses that did.

Chall: Did you lose everything except what you carried?

Wellman: Oh sure, except what we were able to carry out ourselves--a few clothes, some wedding presents, and my typewriter (but no books). We could have saved all of our possessions, if we had asked nearby students who were watching the coming flames to help us. But we never thought of that. We had taken out fire insurance in Wisconsin but had neglected to transfer it to Berkeley.

Chall: Quite a loss. Had you collected a great number of books?

Wellman: No, not a great number, but still quite a few. One of the things that graduate students at the University of Wisconsin did was to start building a personal library. I haunted used book shops there and made a fair start.

Chall: You lost those books?

Wellman: Yes, all of them. I got my master's degree here in 1924.

Chall: I see. You did not get a master's degree at Wisconsin then?

Wellman: No. I was there only one semester--I got my master's degree here.
My master's thesis was a study of various pooling systems employed in cooperative citrus packing houses in the state. Later, I expanded the study to include deciduous fruits. That became the basis for my Ph.D. dissertation.

The members of my doctoral committees--qualifying, dissertation, and final--were Professors Henry E. Erdman (chairman), R.L. Adams, Paul F. Cadman, Ira B. Cross, F.L. Griffin, and H.J. Silbering.

I had the feeling, at the time, that I did not do well in my qualifying examination--entirely oral. On the other hand, I was well satisfied with my doctoral dissertation and with my final examination. A few days ago, I reread the summary of my doctoral dissertation. I still think it is pretty good. The principles stated there are, I believe, still valid.

That is fine; it has stood the test of time. Do you credit Mr. Erdman for assistance in your knowledge of marketing?

Yes indeed, not only from what I learned in his classes and seminars, but perhaps even more from what he encouraged me to do. He believed in getting out in the field, observing what was going on, and in finding out why. He encouraged me to undertake field research, and he made it financially possible for me to do so--the department paid my travel expenses. He also believed in reading everything that had been written about the subject being researched, and he insisted that his graduate students do the same. I learned from Dr. Erdman the importance of recording on cards references to items I had come across.

Henry Erdman's trait?

Yes, over the years Professor Erdman accumulated literally thousands of references on all aspects of marketing agricultural products. He had a great curiosity that caused him some difficulty. He could not resist the temptations to leave the main road and explore the byways. Hence, he was slow in bringing a project to completion, and his list of publications was relatively short.

That probably made him an excellent teacher though.

He was, I believe, an excellent teacher; but not, I think, because of his tendency in research of running down all possible leads, however faint and straying from the main path to explore interesting but little related side trails.
Wellman: In teaching, he stayed pretty much on the main road. His material was well organized and clearly presented. He gave students freely of his time. He was always available to them—both undergraduate and graduate. He never hid away in a study inaccessible to students.

Chall: Do you have any feeling, as you look back, even considering today the tremendous pressure there is for publishing, whether this is essential? Should a really fine teacher be penalized because he is not publishing much?

Wellman: Well, I have the feeling that in appointments and promotions of faculty, too much emphasis was placed on research and not enough on teaching. Considering quantity alone, without regard to quality, the faculty member who did much research and only a moderate amount of teaching was more highly rewarded than one who did much teaching and only a moderate amount of research. As the individual in President Kerr's office who reviewed all recommendations for tenure appointments, promotions, and over-scale salary increases, I was a party to that practice. However, we made a start looking toward some correction. We asked that all recommendations for promotions and over-scale salary increases include evidence on the amount of teaching being done. Even that modest request was met with some opposition by faculty committees.

The basic issue of giving greater weight to teaching, however, relates not to determining the amount of teaching being done by the candidate, but to evaluating the quality of that teaching. It must be recognized, and I want to emphasize this point, that it is much more difficult to evaluate the quality of teaching than the quality of research. There are several cogent reasons for this, but I will not go into them now. They accounted, I think, for the reluctance of Academic Senate committees to pronounce judgment on the quality of teaching by candidates for appointments, promotions, and salary increases.

They did not want to declare on the basis of the evidence available to them which they considered to be inadequate that one person's teaching is outstanding, another person's teaching is good but not outstanding, and still another person's teaching is only fair or even poor. I understand that more evidence is being collected now on the quality of the teaching of individual faculty members, and that more weight is being given to teaching in appointments, promotions, and salary increases. All to the good.
Agricultural Extension Service: Extension Specialist in Agricultural Economics, 1925-1934

Chall: As I understand it, you went directly from graduate school to the staff of the Agricultural Extension Service?

Wellman: Yes, but that was not my intention until a few months before I started to work there.

In the spring of 1925, Professor Erdman had offered me a position on the Davis campus to teach principles of economics to degree students and elementary agricultural economics to nondegree students; rank--instructor; salary--$2,000 a year (eleven months basis). I gladly accepted. The only drawback was that Ruth and I did not look forward to living in Davis during the hot summers, especially after enjoying the cool summers in Berkeley. But the job would give me the opportunity to concentrate upon what I thought then that I wanted most to do--teaching.

There were two things that I thought that I did not want to do: one was to take a job that would keep me away from home, and the other was to spend a lot of time on research.

Chall: Well, "publish or perish" was not quite the thing at the time.

Wellman: I guess not. At least I was not aware of it. Actually, I did not realize that research was held to be of primary importance in appointments and promotions until sometime after I had transferred from Agricultural Extension to the Division of Agricultural Economics in 1935.
Wellman: Sometime in June, 1925, Professor Erdman called me in and urged me to take a newly established position in the Agricultural Extension Service assembling statistics and making economic analyses of California crops instead of going to Davis. I was quite reluctant.

Chall: Yes, that involved things you did not want to do.

Wellman: But after talking it over with Ruth, we decided that if the position was offered to me, I would accept it. Professor Erdman made an appointment for me to see the director of the Agricultural Extension Service, B.H. Crocheron, who had his office in Agriculture Hall. Director Crocheron offered me the position at a salary $200 a year higher than I would have received at Davis because, as he said, "You would be away from home more." I started work October 1, 1925, immediately after I had finished my Ph.D. dissertation.

I did not know at the time that Professor Erdman had expected that the special appropriation by the state legislature for economic analyses of California agricultural products would be under his supervision as chairman of the Division of Agricultural Economics. Why the funds were earmarked for Agricultural Extension, I do not quite know. But despite his disappointment, Professor Erdman backed up the project wholeheartedly.

Economic Analyses of California Crops and Prices

Wellman: Director Crocheron decided that the reports should be published as circulars in a separate series of the Agricultural Extension Service under the general title California Crops and Prices followed by the name of the crop. The first one was on peaches and was published in April, 1926. In the foreward, Director Crocheron wrote,

"This publication is the first of a series, each of which will discuss the economics of a crop prominent in California agriculture. Heretofore, those who desire to consult the statistics for any particular crop were compelled to search through a long and varied list of references scattered in publications of many bureaus of the State and Federal governments and of various private agencies. This publication attempts to bring the material together in one publication and to present it in graphic form."
Wellman: In that publication I fitted trend lines mathematically to quite a few series, using only an adding machine. In preparing my second publication--Lettuce, issued in November, 1926--I had access to a hand calculating machine; and in preparing my third publication--Apricots, issued in May, 1927--I had the help of a full-time statistical clerk.

In July, 1927, Elmer W. Braun, who later completed his Ph.D. at Columbia University, came to work with me. Between then and the end of 1932, he and I were joint authors of seven commodity analyses, and I was sole author of two others. Dr. Braun was sole author of three others.

After seeing the first one or two of the analyses which had been published under the general title, California Crops and Prices, Professor Erdman was, I suspect, even more convinced than before that such work represented substantial research and was worthy of being undertaken by members of the Division of Agricultural Economics. In any event, both Professor Edwin C. Voorhies and Dr. Sherwood Shear started work in the area: Professor Voorhies on livestock and livestock products, and Dr. Shear on fruits. This was eminently satisfactory to me and, I believe, also to Director Crocheron. It was clearly impossible for one or two, or even three or four people to cover all of California's many agricultural commodities within any reasonable length of time, and to revise and bring the analyses up-to-date every five years or so, as should be done.

Professor Erdman, along with Professor Voorhies and Dr. Shear, felt that the analyses prepared by them should be published as Agricultural Experiment Station bulletins rather than as Agricultural Extension Service circulars. The basic reason, I suspect, was their belief that Experiment Station bulletins, being publications of research, would commend more respect by their academic colleagues throughout the country, and especially by the Academic Senate committees within the University that recommend on faculty salary increase and promotions. In this, they were undoubtedly right.

Although salaries and promotions of Agricultural Extension Service employees were not under the purview of the Academic Senate, Director Crocheron decided that economic analyses prepared by members of his staff should have the same status as those prepared by faculty members of the Division of Agricultural Economics. Hence, all subsequent economic analyses which Dr. Braun and I prepared were published as Agricultural
Wellman: Experiment Station bulletins. This was of substantial benefit to me when I transferred to the Division of Agricultural Economics in 1935. I had an impressive list of research monographs for review by the Academic Senate committees.

The last comprehensive commodity analysis which I undertook was published in December, 1932, and was on the same crop as my initial study published nearly seven years earlier--namely, peaches. This type of work was continued for many years by other members of the Agricultural Extension Service and the Department of Agricultural Economics.

Chall: Did you have to go out in the field and get material?

Wellman: Yes, some. I tried to become acquainted with the conditions in the field. I visited the main producing areas in the state for the particular crop I was working on at the time. I talked with farm advisors, leading growers, and handlers. Many of the statistical series were compiled from official sources; others were obtained from marketing organizations--both cooperative associations and private firms.

Upon completion of each study, I presented a summary using large charts to audiences of growers and others--including shippers and processors. On these trips, I would be away from home several days at a time.

Outlook Reports

Wellman: A closely related line of work on which I was engaged from 1928 through 1933 was the preparation of annual outlook reports on important California agricultural products. Several of my colleagues participated in this project, especially Braun, Shear, and Voorhies. The last of the regularly issued annual outlook reports was for 1937. Since then periodic reports on individual commodities have come out from time to time.

The statements in the California agricultural outlook reports on products grown throughout the United States were condensations and adaptations from the federal outlook reports prepared by the USDA Bureau of Agricultural Economics. The statements on California speciality crops were based upon the economic analyses which I have already mentioned. Without such
Wellman: comprehensive analyses, annual outlook statements would not have been possible.

Chall: I see. Now how did those help the farmers?

Wellman: I can tell you how they were supposed to help farmers, but I doubt that I can tell you how much, if any, they actually helped farmers.

As to how they were supposed to help farmers, I can do no better than quote from what I wrote in The 1929 California Outlook for California, our first annual outlook report. Here it is.

"... This report presents a summary of the present available facts bearing upon the future economic conditions of important farm products in California. If farmers are to avoid losses which result from extreme expansion or contraction, these facts should be given careful consideration when increasing or decreasing acreage of crops or numbers of livestock."

The reports were widely distributed each year—some 30,000 to 35,000 copies were printed. Day-long meetings were held with groups of farm advisors. At first it was hoped that farm advisors in turn would present outlook information at meetings of farmers within their counties. But having had little or no training in economics they were hesitant to do so. I usually attended one or two meetings of growers in the more important producing districts.

Certainly, many commercial farmers had an opportunity to read and discuss the content of outlook statements pertaining to the commodities they produced. To what extent, if any, those farmers were influenced by what they had read and heard, I have no means of knowing.

In retrospect, I am inclined to think that those of us in the land-grant colleges and universities and in the United States Department of Agriculture who were engaged in outlook work in the late 1920s and early 1930s were much too optimistic, both as to the number of farmers who would pay attention to the forecasts and to the accuracy of the forecasts themselves.

Another line of work that grew out of the economic studies was the statistical analyses of factors influencing the prices of selected California speciality crops. My first price analysis
Wellman: was on California canned clingstone peaches made in the spring of 1930. That was followed by price analyses on California canned apricots, Pacific Coast canned pears, and California oranges.

In 1929, a statistician in the Federal Bureau of Agricultural Economics, by the name of Louis H. Bean, had developed a short-cut graphic method of correlation analysis which greatly reduced the time that was required in fitting mathematical equations with the hand-cranked calculating machines in use at that time. I immediately adopted that method and found it exceedingly useful. Without it, I could not have done the work on price analysis that I did--making the original analyses and revising and bringing them up-to-date annually. High speed computers did not exist at that time.

Marketing Control Programs

Wellman: Largely as the result of my work on commodity analyses, outlook reports, and price analyses, I became involved in marketing control programs especially for canning peaches and oranges.

Beginning in 1927 and continuing until I went to Washington, D.C., in 1934, I attended a great many meetings of canning peach growers and canners concerned with developing marketing control programs. My role was chiefly that of providing economic information including the effects of the volume of shipments of canned peaches upon the prices realized by canners.

Marketing control programs for California clingstone peaches of one sort or another were instituted on a voluntary basis in 1927, 1928, 1930, and 1931. The 1929 crop was very short because of a severe freeze, and prices to growers skyrocketed to $80 a ton. In 1932 growers and canners did not get together on a program, and prices to growers plunged to $7.50 a ton. The 1933 crop was under an AAA marketing agreement and license. The average price to growers that year was $20 a ton.

In the spring of 1932, I spoke at eighteen meetings of orange growers throughout the citrus producing areas of the state on the subject Factors Affecting Orange Prices and Economics of Surplus Control. The interest was intense.
Wellman: Attendance ranged from a low of fifty to a high of seven hundred. Prices of oranges had fallen to disastrously low levels. I doubt that many growers understood the detailed price analysis which I presented with the aid of large charts; but they did, I think, understand the conclusions drawn. In brief, I said that California orange growers could increase their returns per acre in years of surpluses by limiting shipments--provided all or a large proportion of the growers participated.

How much, if any, effect those meetings had upon subsequent events, I do not really know, but they may have had some. That June, about 90 percent of the Valencia orange shippers agreed to a shipment control program, but it lasted only four weeks. The following year a similar program was undertaken, and it lasted throughout the season. In 1934 a marketing agreement under the federal Agricultural Adjustment Administration was instituted.

Extension Leadership: B.H. Crocheron and J.E. Tippett

Chall: Can you tell me a little bit about Mr. Crocheron?

Wellman: As I have stated, I worked under Bertram H. Crocheron from October, 1925 until I left for Washington, D.C., in February, 1934. He was an impressive man in appearance and speech. He was tall, handsome, and always immaculately dressed. He was one of the best public speakers in the University--the equal, it seemed to me, of Robert Gordon Sproul. Socially, he was gracious but reserved. He was widely read and an interesting conversationalist, but he had little use for small talk.

Chall: Was Mr. Crocheron a good administrator?

Wellman: I think he was. Without question he was the chief architect and builder of the California Agricultural Extension Service, and during his time the California Agricultural Extension Service was one of the best, if not the best, state agricultural extension services in the nation.

Director Crocheron had the reputation both inside and outside the Extension Service of being something of a dictator. I saw some evidence of this in the way he conducted monthly meetings of the headquarter's staff and annual meetings of the entire staff. Among themselves, the staff commonly referred to
Wellman: Director Crocheron as "The Chief."

Let me hasten to add that, as far as my own work was concerned, he gave me almost complete freedom within the broad outlines of the project for which I was employed. I chose what crops to study, what material to be included, and how to present it. He would stop in my office every month or two to express an interest in the work and ask me what, if anything, I needed. I could not have had better support. He was not, however, an easy person to talk with. When I had a problem that required his attention, I would make an appointment to go in to see him and state the problem as briefly as I could. He would ask me a few questions and then say, "I think you had better do this." We never had long discussions.

Chall: He was here a long time in that post?

Wellman: Yes, for a long time--from 1913 until his death in 1948.

Chall: Did you learn anything from Mr. Crocheron about administration--about what to do and what not to do--from observing him over the years?

Wellman: Yes, I think I did. Director Crocheron never criticized any of his staff members before others, and he never allowed anyone else to do so. If one of his staff did something that displeased him, he would call him in and tell him so in private. If anyone else wanted to complain to Director Crocheron about one of his staff, he had to do so in private. He praised members of his staff before others but never rebuked them before others. He was quick to reward those who did outstanding work, and he tried to help those who did poor work to improve their performance. If they failed to improve, he eased them out very quietly. I suppose that I learned other things about administration from watching Director Crocheron, but I cannot, at the moment, identify them directly with him.

He also influenced me in other ways--some unimportant, some important. He wore a mustache--I grew one. He was well groomed--I tried to be. He was always punctual--I learned to be on time. He read widely--I expanded my reading to include many of the Harvard Classics. He prepared his public speeches carefully and rehearsed them in advance--I followed that practice, although I never acquired his fluency and excellence of delivery.
Wellman: To my mind he was an ideal director for the California Agricultural Extension Service at the time, and that time stretched over many years. I had great admiration and respect for him, but we were never close friends.

Chall: What about Mr. Tippett—was he Mr. Crocheron's assistant all these years?

Wellman: Yes he was. Joseph Ellsworth Tippett, called Tipp by most of us, was Director Crocheron's right hand man for thirty years. He handled the numerous details involved in the administration of an organization with staff located throughout the state, and he did it very well. I consulted with him more often than I did with Director Crocheron. He was always helpful.

I have said that Director Crocheron was the architect and builder of the California Agricultural Extension Service. Tipp was the foreman of the works and a most capable one.

He was the best-loved man in the California Agricultural Extension Service. Far beyond the call of duty, he helped many staff members with their personal problems—how many I do not know—but long after I left the Agricultural Extension Service, I would hear directly from the people involved or indirectly from mutual friends that Tipp had helped them on a serious personal problem.

Staff members admired Director Crocheron for what he had done and was doing to enhance the status of the organization of which they were a part—they loved Tipp for what he had done and was doing for them personally.

Interim With the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, 1934-1935

Chall: Could you tell me how you happened to become a member of the AAA in Washington, D.C., in 1934?

Wellman: Jesse W. Tapp, assistant administrator of the Division of Markets and Marketing Agreements, AAA, asked me in January, 1934, to be chief of the General Crops section in that division. California speciality crops were in that section.
In the summer of 1933, I had spent about six weeks in Washington, D.C., helping develop a marketing agreement for California clingstone peaches. This was at the request of Howard R. Tolley, who had been on leave of absence from the University since mid-May, and who was serving as chief of the General Crops section. During my stay in Washington, D.C., that summer, I had become acquainted with Jesse W. Tapp, a former colleague of Tolley's in the Federal Bureau of Agricultural Economics. There began a friendship that lasted until his death in 1969.

Before going to Washington, D.C., in early July, 1933, I had spent virtually full time for the previous two months helping to develop a proposed marketing control plan for canning cling peaches with a committee of canners and representatives of growers' organizations.

After many discussions with canner and grower groups in Washington, D.C., both before and after the public hearing there, an acceptable agreement was finally pounded out. A copy of the agreement was sent to California by leased wire (Tolley and I stayed up all one Sunday night to see that that was done). It was the second marketing agreement under the AAA. It became effective August 17, 1933, and was entitled Marketing Agreement for Cling Peaches Canned in the State of California.

When Chester Davis became administrator of the AAA in December, 1933, he appointed Tolley as assistant administrator in charge of the Division of Program Planning and Tapp as assistant administrator in charge of the Division of Marketing and Marketing Agreements. I took over Tolley's former position as chief of the General Crops section. I suppose the crops assigned to it were called "general" to distinguish them from crops named "basic" in the Agricultural Adjustment Act.

And you just moved to Washington with your family?

Yes, we packed up our personal belongings, rode the train to Washington, rented an unfurnished apartment, and bought some furniture and a car. Our daughter, Nancy, was nearly two years old.

For me, 1934 was an interesting, exciting, and hectic year. The people in the AAA with which I was most closely associated felt that they were part of a great national effort to rescue
Wellman: agriculture from the depths of the depression--not only for the
benefit of farmers and their families, but also for the benefit
of everybody. It was our firm belief that economic recovery
in agriculture would favorably influence the whole economy.

The sense of urgency was contagious. Everybody, or at
least most everybody, worked long hours. For the first two
months that I was in Washington, I had only two dinners at
home; and those two were on a Sunday. My usual schedule was
to leave the house at 7:00 a.m. and return around 10:00-11:00 p.m.--
riding with Jesse Tapp whenever he was in town. Later on, I
would get home for dinner on three or four evenings a week at
around 7:30-8:00 p.m.

Before I arrived in Washington in mid-February, 1934, ten
marketing agreements and licenses in the General Crops section
had been issued. During the next twelve months, an additional
nineteen were issued. Most of them were on fruits and vegetables,
but they also included gum turpentine and rosin and package bees
and queens. The General Crops section was also responsible for
administering some NRA codes. The staff was exceedingly busy.

Chall: Were you able to hire staff, or was the staff already there?

Wellman: Most of the staff was recruited from within the USDA--largely
from the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. Others were brought
in from land-grant colleges and universities and a few from
agricultural industries. Tolley had hired Elmer Braun, who
had worked with me, and also James Poole--one of our graduate
students. I hired S.R. Smith, another of our graduate students,
and also Donald Rubel who had taken his undergraduate work in
agricultural economics here.

Philosophical Differences Within AAA

Chall: While you were all trying to save the economy, there were
different ideas about how that might be done. I do not know
about your particular section, but from the top down was there
not considerable controversy?

Wellman: There was some controversy. How extensive it was, I do not know.
Wellman: As far as the General Crops section was concerned, our disagreements were mainly with the general counsel's office. We felt that that office was trying to reform the agricultural marketing system through the marketing agreements, and we didn't think that was any of their business. We did not object to the consumers' counsel staff urging provisions that they felt were needed to protect consumers, although we seldom agreed with them. Our view was that we should concentrate on improving growers' returns and marketing reform to later.

The provision on books and records was the most troublesome. I realized the need for enough access to the handlers' books and records to detect and successfully prosecute violations, but I saw little justification for more. The general counsel (Jerome Frank), on the other hand, insisted on virtually unlimited access. Handlers, especially California canners and dried fruit packers, were suspicious of his motive. They feared that he was bent on a "fishing expedition" to obtain information to reform the marketing system to their disadvantage rather than to detect violations of the marketing agreement. I shared their feelings.

In early July, 1934 (I was in Berkeley on July 4), I had to make a hurry-up trip to San Francisco to try to persuade canners to sign the proposed cling peach agreement. I was successful due in part to the fact that I was able to convince canners that neither Chester Davis, Jesse Tapp, nor I would abuse the access to books and records granted to the secretary of agriculture. The other factor was that--based on an updating of the price analysis on canned clingstone peaches which I had started in 1930--I persuaded canners that the price per ton demanded by growers was not unreasonably high in view of the prospective size of the crop. Actually, the crop turned out lower than the July 1 forecast because of a spell of extremely hot weather. Growers, not canners, had cause for complaint.

The 1934 cling peach agreement was the last marketing agreement under the AAA to be signed by California canners partly, I suspect, because of the books and records clause.

Chall: According to Walter Packard, who worked for you in 1934 handling marketing agreements on the Pacific Coast, you were the controlling figure, and you had the confidence of growers and handlers in the whole process of developing marketing agreements.
Wellman: Walter Packard was the representative of the General Crops section on the Pacific Coast the year I was in Washington. He lived in our house in Berkeley while we were gone. I think I did have the confidence of growers and handlers—canners, packers, and shippers of fruits and vegetables—at least I hope so. I had gotten acquainted with many of them through my work in the Agricultural Extension Service.

Chall: Were you in Washington at the time of the so called "purge" when Jerome Frank was fired?

Wellman: Yes, I was there, but I didn't now a thing about it until I read it in the Washington Post the next morning.

Chall: How did it affect the staff in general?

Wellman: Well, I can only speak for the General Crops staff. We were pleased—to put it mildly. We had blamed Frank for much of the delay in getting our marketing agreements approved, whether rightly or wrongly, and we resented the intrusion of his staff into policy matters and their insistence upon much broader access to books and records than we thought necessary.

An incident involving Frank, Tapp, and me may be of interest. One Saturday afternoon (it was in connection with the California raisin agreement), Frank decided he wanted to change a provision that had been agreed to all up the line including Tapp. Tapp could not talk him out of it. He (Frank) demanded return of the five copies of the completed document which had been approved as to form by his office. I had all five copies in my possession. Sunday morning, Tapp and I left town with the five copies and did not return until late that evening. Ruth reported that the general counsel's office had been trying to reach me.

Early Monday morning, I took the five copies to Davis' office for his signature. I did not have an appointment and waited in his outer office all day, but he did not come into his office that day. The next morning, along about 10:00 a.m., I got in to see him. He signed the documents and took them personally to Secretary Wallace who also signed them. Thus, the 1934 California Raisin Marketing Agreement came into existence.

Chall: Before we go on, did you ever know George Peek?
Wellman: No, I met him only once, and that was in the summer of 1933.

Chall: Was there any opinion about him around the department?

Wellman: I do not know. I was too busy working on the marketing agreement on cling peaches to be concerned with anything else.

Chall: I see. It was a hectic month. But Chester Davis, then, was in charge of AAA.

Wellman: Chester Davis replaced George Peek as administrator of AAA in December, 1933, and he was in charge when I became chief of the General Crops section in February, 1934.

Chall: What kind of a person was he from your point of view?

Wellman: A capable administrator and a delightful person. Actually, I had very little contact with him then. I talked with him only three or four times during the year I was in Washington, D.C. After he retired to California, I became well acquainted with him. In the spring of 1955, he was Regents' Professor in Agricultural Economics on the Berkeley Campus. My opinion of him professionally and my affection for him personally grew with the years.

As chief of the General Crops section, I reported directly to Jesse W. Tapp.

Chall: What was he like?

Wellman: I cannot speak too highly of Jesse Tapp professionally and personally. His home in Washington, D.C., was a short distance beyond our apartment, and I rode to and from work with him in his car. In his position he rated a parking space in the South Building, and at that time, a parking space was a great convenience. It probably still is. We did much of our business together, riding back and forth.

The characteristics which impressed me most about Tapp were his ability to cut through a mass of details and center on the main issues of a problem and his ability to persuade conflicting groups to compromise their differences and work together. He did his "homework," and he had a great capacity for making friends.
Wellman: After he came to California, in 1937, with the Bank of America, we worked together on quite a few agricultural industry problems. In December, 1964, when John Watson, chairman of the State Board of Agriculture, and by reason thereof, an ex officio member of the Board of Regents, died suddenly, I suggested to President Kerr that Tapp would be an excellent replacement. President Kerr passed the suggestion on to Governor Brown. Tapp's appointment to the position proved to be excellent from the standpoint of the University and, I believe, also from the standpoint of California agriculture. Governor Reagan did not reappoint him.

Chall: What about the other people in the AAA? We have not even talked about Mr. Tolley and I think we should.

Wellman: I was much better acquainted with Tolley's work as director of the Giannini Foundation of Agricultural Economics and chairman of the Department of Agricultural Economics here at the University than I was with his work in the AAA. My closest contact with him in the AAA was in connection with the development of the cling peach marketing agreement in the summer of 1933. On several critical occasions, he was able to resolve differences between the AAA staff and industry representatives. Without his effective mediation and insistence on prompt action, it is doubtful that an agreement would have been reached in time to do any good. The crop was fast maturing.

In 1934 Tolley was engaged primarily in program planning for the entire AAA and had little time for day-to-day operations. However, on several occasions, he smoothed my way in getting the necessary approvals of Chester Davis and Secretary of Agriculture Henry C. Wallace.

In the University I worked under Tolley for only a few months in 1936. When he first came here in the summer of 1930 until he went with the AAA in the spring of 1933, I was in the Agricultural Extension Service. Nevertheless, I became well acquainted with him and had the opportunity of observing his performance. I thought it was excellent. He and I became fast friends and that friendship lasted until his death in 1958.

Tolley made two very important and lasting contributions during the three years he was here. He enlarged, substantially, the graduate program in agricultural economics and enhanced its reputation around the country, and he started the famed Giannini Foundation Library and employed a professional librarian to run it.
Chall: What about M.L. Wilson? Did you ever know him?

Wellman: I knew him, but not well. Everything that I heard about him was favorable. Chester Davis and Howard Tolley, in particular, spoke highly of him.

Chall: And Mordecai Ezekial—did you know him?

Wellman: Yes, I first met him, as I recall, at the USDA Outlook Conference in Washington, D.C., in 1929, and I saw him quite a few times after that.

He was a capable statistician. Tolley used his book, Methods of Correlation Analysis, in the graduate course in analytical methods which he gave here; and I continued to use it when I took over the course when Tolley returned to Washington, D.C., in the spring of 1936.

Tolley told me that he tried to persuade Ezekial to join the faculty here but was unsuccessful.

During the year I was with the AAA, Ezekial was in the office of the secretary of agriculture. I had little direct contact with him.

One other person whom I should mention is Thomas C. Blaisdell, Jr. He is now Professor Emeritus of Political Science on the Berkeley Campus. In 1933-1935 he was head of the Consumers' Counsel of the AAA. I met him a few times in connection with marketing agreements. I thought well of him then, and I think highly of him now. His job must have been an extremely frustrating one—probably the most frustrating one in the entire AAA. The overriding urgency in the minds of most people—both inside and outside government at that time—was economic recovery. Consumer protection came in a poor second.

Chall: Was there not some feeling in the AAA that small farmers, particularly the tenant farmers in the South, were not helped by the programs? I understand Chester Davis began to feel a little disconcerted, too.

Wellman: I would be inclined to put it a bit differently. I think it was recognized from the start that the AAA programs would be of little or no help to very small farmers and subsistent farmers. The original Agricultural Adjustment Act was designed to help
Wellman: commercial farmers by raising the market prices of the products they sold. Those who produced and sold only a little of the product were helped only a little—those who produced and sold a lot of the product were helped a lot. Subsistence farmers who produced only for their consumption were helped not at all. After recovery in commercial agriculture had gotten underway, more attention could be given to helping noncommercial farmers and their families.

Chall: Since you went on to greater heights as an administrator, what did you learn at this particular period about administration from what you were doing in Washington?

Wellman: Probably quite a bit. That was my first administrative position, and I learned from necessity and from my close association with Tapp. For example, I learned that you had to be familiar with the particular subject with which you were dealing at the time—not in great detail but in considerable depth. And to acquire that knowledge, you had to put in long hours—longer than any of the people working under you. I also learned the importance of making prompt decisions based not upon snap judgment but upon the best information you can get within the limited time available. Even a poor decision made on time was better than no decision since the poor decision could be changed. Another thing I learned was that capable staff work was essential—that poor staff work could get you into a lot of trouble. Then, too, I learned the importance of listening—listening to your staff and listening to the industry groups (growers and handlers) with whom you were dealing.

Chall: Sidney Hoos had such nice things to say about you as an administrator that I will probably keep picking on you to try to find out whether you were born or made an administrator. I think some people are born administrators.

Wellman: Maybe so. But in my case, whatever ability I developed as an administrator—and I thank Sidney even though he may have exaggerated—was mainly from observation and experience. I have had the good fortune of working under people whom I consider to have been outstanding administrators, namely, B.H. Crocheron, Jesse W. Tapp, Carl Alsberg, Claude B. Hutchison, Robert Gordon Sproul, and Clark Kerr. I tried to copy their strong points and avoid their weak ones, but as you might suspect, I was not entirely successful in doing either.
Appointment to the Faculty of the Giannini Foundation of Agricultural Economics, 1935-1942

Chall: You transferred to the Giannini Foundation and the Department of Agricultural Economics when you returned from Washington?

Wellman: Yes. Hutchison, when he was director of the Giannini Foundation of Agricultural Economics, had offered me a job in the foundation. It was at the time I had just started outlook work, and I thought I should stay with it for a while. However, I did express an interest in transferring to the foundation eventually. Also, I mentioned that interest to Tolley after he had become director.

Around about November or December, 1934, E.A. Stokdyk, then professor of agricultural economics and agricultural economist on the Giannini Foundation, resigned to become president of the Berkeley Bank of Cooperatives of the Federal Farm Credit Administration. That left a vacant position and Hutchison, then dean of the College of Agriculture, offered it to me with the rank of associate professor and associate agricultural economist in the Agricultural Experiment Station and on the Giannini Foundation. When I arrived here in February, 1935, Hutchison told me that the Academic Senate Budget Committee had recommended against my appointment as associate professor on the grounds that I lacked teaching experience which, of course, was true. Also, President Sproul did not feel that he could go against the recommendation of the Budget Committee. I was appointed lecturer in agricultural economics and associate agricultural economist in the Agricultural Experiment Station and on the Giannini Foundation. In July, 1937, I was promoted to associate professor and two years later to full professor.

Chall: You proved yourself.

Wellman: Apparently.

I took over the graduate seminar Stokdyk had been giving on the purpose and scope of state and federal activity in relation to marketing agricultural products. And in the middle of the spring semester of 1936, when Tolley left for Washington, D.C., to become administrator of the AAA, I took over his graduate course in analytical methods in agricultural economics.

In addition to classroom teaching, I began to supervise the research of individual graduate students for the Ph.D. degree.
Donald F. McMillan was my first Ph.D. student and George L. Mehren was my second. McMillan's dissertation was on marketing control programs on California canning cling peaches; Mehren's was on voluntary control programs in the California orange industry. McMillan started working for the California Fruit Growers Exchange, later called Sunkist Growers, and in due course became assistant general manager. Mehren remained with the University until September, 1963. He was director of the Giannini Foundation for five years (1957-1962). In September, 1963, he was appointed assistant secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture. After about three years there, he entered commercial work. He is currently (August, 1974) general manager of the Associated Milk Producers, Inc., the nation's largest dairy cooperative.

Carl Alsberg

Let me back up a moment. Tolley returned to the University the first of January, 1936. About four months later, he went back to Washington, D.C., this time as administrator of AAA replacing Chester Davis who had resigned to become one of the governors of the Federal Reserve System. Hutchison was unwilling to give Tolley an additional leave of absence. He had already been away from the University for nearly three years. Tolley resigned. Hutchison began a search for a replacement. He finally settled on Carl Alsberg, one of the three codirectors of the Food Research Institute of Stanford University. Alsberg reported for duty on October 1, 1937.

Alsberg died suddenly on October 31, 1940. He had served as director of the Giannini Foundation for only three years and one month.

Chall: What kind of changes or new directions was he able to make?

Wellman: There was little, if any, change in the direction the Giannini Foundation during Alsberg's directorship. He was here too short a time. The lines of work of the existing staff members at the time of his arrival were pretty well set and could not be expected to be changed or redirected quickly. Moreover, Alsberg was too experienced in research administration to try to force any staff members to change directions against his wishes.
Wellman: About the only way that new directions can be achieved is through the appointment of new staff members who are qualified and want to do the type of work you think should be emphasized. Alsberg followed that route. He thought the foundation should place more emphasis on quantitative analysis—much the same view that Tolley held. He appointed two promising young men—one with a flair for commodity economics and price analysis and the other with a flair for statistics. The first was Sidney S. Hoos; the second was George M. Kuznets.

I do not want to leave the impression that Alsberg was interested only in commodity economics, although that was the central focus of the Food Research Institute during the sixteen years he had been its codirector. Not so. In fact, his first appointment was S.V. Wantrup who had come to Berkeley the previous July on an outside grant and who was interested in land utilization and conservation. Later, he recruited Dorothy S. Thomas, a population expert. In these areas, as in others, he was suspicious of conclusions unsupported by factual evidence—a reflection of his training in the physical sciences.

Alsberg held regular staff conferences on research at which each staff member, in turn, presented a statement on the research he was doing at the time following which there was general discussion. I found them to be quite helpful.

As far as my own work was concerned, Alsberg gave me all possible aid in the way of research assistants and clerical help. He must have thought well of what I was doing. As I have mentioned, I was promoted to full professor on July 1, 1939, after only two years as associate professor. That would not have happened without a strong and persuasive recommendation from him.

Let me say just a word about Carl Alsberg, as a person, as I came to know him. He was friendly, kind, courteous, considerate, and unpretentious. But the rarest thing about him to my mind was his knowledge of many different fields of learning. He was the most broadly educated person I have ever known.

Chall: A real intellectual??

Wellman: In a broad sense, yes.
Wellman: I took up my research and extension activities about where I had left off the year before although at a reduced level—owing to the time devoted to teaching—even though I had transferred from the Agricultural Extension Service to the Department of Agricultural Economics Giannini Foundation. I never did know precisely where research left off and extension began, nor was I ever interested in a sharp separation between the two.

Price analyses continued to occupy a good portion of my time. I revised and kept up to date my price analyses on canning apricots, peaches, pears, and fresh oranges—and I added canned asparagus and lemons.

I also spent considerable time in assisting industry groups in the revision of existing marketing control programs and in the development of new marketing control programs. The information gained was useful to me in teaching my graduate seminar on the economic effects of state and federal activities in the marketing of agricultural products. The students were encouraged to wrestle with live problems.

During this period, I had become increasingly concerned about the effectiveness of marketing control programs. Fredrick V. Waugh, an eminent agricultural economist with the USDA, and I prepared an outline on the economic effects of market prorates, but we never got around to writing a full-scale monograph. I encouraged graduate students and later some of the newly appointed staff to undertake comprehensive analyses of particular programs. Considerable progress was made but not as much as I had hoped.

The principle new line of research that I undertook during the years 1935-1940 was an analysis of the pooling of lemons by cooperative packing houses. A graduate student, M.D. Street, was my research assistant. He is listed as junior author on the publication, "Maintenance of Substantial Equity in the Pooling of Lemons," California Agricultural Experiment Station, Bulletin 619. The findings were adopted widely by lemon packing houses throughout the state.
III DIRECTOR OF THE GIANNINI FOUNDATION OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS; CHAIRMAN OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS, 1942-1952

Chall: Now we should talk about your decade as director of the Giannini Foundation.

Wellman: Okay. First, however, I should make it clear—if I have not already done so—that the director of the Giannini Foundation had, beginning with Tolley's term, also been chairman of the Department of Agricultural Economics. Thus, he had responsibility for teaching as well as for research and, in addition, had some responsibility for Extension programs in agricultural economics although not for the personnel. That arrangement, at least while I was active in the area, worked out well. It facilitated coordination of research and teaching and, to some extent, Extension. All Extension specialists in agricultural economics received appointments without salary as associates on the Giannini Foundation.

The Giannini Foundation of Agricultural Economics and the Department of Agricultural Economics were administered as a joint unit, with the foundation funds being used for research and extension and the department funds being used for teaching as well as for research and extension. The terms of the Giannini Foundation gift clearly implied that foundation funds should be used for research and extension in agricultural economics, but not for teaching.

For convenience, I suggest that this joint unit be called the Foundation-Department, and that its head be called the Director-Chairman.

Chall: That sounds all right to me.
Wellman: Administration of the foundation-department did not take up much of my time during the war years. I became director-chairman on April 18, 1942, a little over four months after Pearl Harbor.

As head of the foundation-department, I had the responsibility for insuring that classes desired by students would be given. That was not difficult. Student enrollment dropped sharply after 1941-42 and continued downward until the end of the war. In 1944-45 there were only a few undergraduate students in agricultural economics and almost no graduate students. We had an excess of faculty for teaching needs.

Requests for foundation-department assistance by the agricultural interests of the state also declined sharply. Farm management was the principal area for which there was much demand. Scarcities of food and fiber replaced surpluses. Increasingly, the national need was for all-out production.

Our policy, under those circumstances, was to encourage every faculty member to do whatever he thought best. It was my feeling at the time that each faculty member should decide for himself whether he should enlist in the armed forces, accept war-related employment, or remain at the University. If he remained at the University, he was encouraged to do what he could to help in the war effort.

Mehren and Tinley enlisted in the armed forces; Benedict and Hoos were in war-related departments of the federal government; Voorhies served as dean of students on the Berkeley campus.

My own activities as a faculty member were quite varied. I taught classes in the spring semesters of 1942 and 1943 but not in 1944 or 1945. Student enrollment in agricultural economics was almost nil in the latter years. In 1944 only one graduate student, an Egyptian, completed his Ph.D. under me.

I made quite a few trips to Washington, D.C., at the request of the War Food Administration and the Office of Price Administration in connection with price ceilings on agricultural products—especially on fruits and vegetables.

Chall: It is not fair perhaps to bring up an old article that I read,
but you wrote that you preferred rationing, high taxes, and compulsory savings to price fixing indicating that, if you were going to fix any prices, you would have to fix them all; and then you would have to do the same thing for wages. It looked to you like a tremendously difficult task.

Wellman: I do not remember the particular article, but I do recall my skepticism about the feasibility and fairness of fixing the prices of all commodities, all wages and all rents. Possibly the difficulty of developing a satisfactory system of price ceilings on fresh fruits and vegetables influenced my general conclusion. It is easy to generalize from a few cases and often fallacious. Nevertheless, the stress of price ceilings on consumer goods and services could, I think, have been eased by draining off excess purchasing power through higher taxes and compulsory saving.

In peacetime, price controls are even more unworkable than in wartime. I doubt that peacetime inflation can be curbed in the absence of a balanced federal budget.

I noted that you were a member of the Committee on Post-War Agricultural Policy of the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities.

Wellman: Yes. That was probably my most important activity in 1944. The committee was authorized by the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities at the time our Dean Hutchison was president of the association. The committee consisted of nineteen members drawn from land-grant colleges and universities from Vermont to California and from Minnesota to Louisiana. Noble Clark, associate director of the Agricultural Experiment Station, University of Wisconsin, was chairman of the committee. The committee held some eight to ten meetings by itself and, in addition, held a series of regional conferences throughout the nation and consulted with USDA specialists and national farm organization officials. The secretary of the committee, Professor Leonard A. Salter, Jr., of the University of Wisconsin, and I spent several days in Madison editing the final report.

An outside activity which I engaged in during the war years and for some years thereafter was as a director of the Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco. I also served as deputy chairman of the board.
Appointment to the Federal Reserve Board

Chall: How did you come to be appointed?

Wellman: I was appointed by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, I suspect, on the recommendations of Jesse Tapp who was then vice-president of the Bank of America and Chester Davis who had been on the board of governors and, at that time, was president of the Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis. The fact that I was director of the Giannini Foundation and fairly well known by agricultural leaders in California probably helped. I continued on the board of directors until 1952.

Chall: Was your service as director of the Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco of value to you?

Wellman: Yes, I think it was. For one thing it gave me the opportunity of becoming acquainted with the leading bankers of the state. It also gave me the opportunity of seeing how a multibranch governmental agency was administered. Quite a bit of authority over day-to-day operations was delegated to the branches. There were four branches--Los Angeles, Portland, Seattle, and Salt Lake City. The board of directors had a separate auditing staff which reported to it. All significant departures from the policies and procedures established by the board were promptly reported to it; and soon thereafter the board received a report on the corrections made or, if not yet made, why not.

In looking back on decentralization of University operations to the campuses, I am inclined to think that there should have been more comprehensive and frequent audits of performance, with the reports going directly to the president of the University who, in turn, would discuss them with the appropriate committees of the Regents.

With the end of the war, my responsibilities as director-chairman became both greater and more interesting. Also, my work as a faculty member apart from my administrative duties was enjoyable. In fact, the combination of administration, teaching, research, and extension which I had from 1946 to 1952 was in many ways ideal for me. Why I left it for full-time administration is still, after all of these years, something of a mystery to me.
Post-War Policies and Research Projects

Chall: There was a big increase in enrollment in agricultural economics following the war?

Wellman: Yes, in both undergraduate and graduate students, starting in the spring semester of 1946 and continuing upward for several years. The Department does not now have the actual enrollments for those years. Apparently, they were a casualty of the University records disposal program.

Fortunately, at Berkeley, the department was able to take care of the increased teaching load without much difficulty. Benedict, Mehren, and Tinley, who were on leave of absence during much of the war period, had returned. Voorhies was back full time with the department from serving as dean of students on the Berkeley campus. Hoos, who had resigned in 1942, rejoined the department. Faculty members who had remained with the foundation-department during the war--Adams, Erdman, Kuznets, Wantrup, Weeks, and myself--were also ready to resume their prewar classes. Raymond G. Bressler, Jr., joined the foundation-department in July, 1948, and over the years contributed much to all of its activities--teaching, research, and extension.

The courses which I taught most frequently following the war were an upper division course in market prices of agricultural products, a graduate course in analytical methods in agricultural economics, and a graduate seminar in governmental agricultural policies. Also, in one or more semesters, I taught a lower division course in elementary statistics and a graduate seminar in marketing agricultural products.

Chall: It is generally claimed that the postwar students were more mature and more serious than the prewar students.

Wellman: That was certainly true in agricultural economics. We had only male students as far as I can recall. Most of them had served in the armed forces for one or more years. They looked upon a university education as a means of earning a higher income.

I remember very few of the undergraduate students in agricultural economics during the immediate postwar years. Our graduate students, at that time, were outstanding; and all of those whose subsequent careers I have followed closely have done exceedingly well. Several are full professors of agricultural
Wellman: economics on the Berkeley or Davis campus--James N. Boles, David A. Clarke, Jr. (Clarke died July 31, 1974), Jerry Foytik, Benjamin C. French, Loy L. Sammet, and John H. Snyder. Also, Werner Z. Hirsch is professor of economics at UCLA, Henry J. Vaux is professor of forestry at Berkeley, Robert L. Clodius is Universitywide Professor at the University of Wisconsin, and Jimmy S. Hillman is professor of agricultural economics at the University of Arizona. In addition to their professorships, all except one have held administrative positions: Boles, Clarke, French, Sammet, and Hillman--the chairmanship of departments; Clarke, Snyder, Sammet, and Hirsch--the directorship of a research institute; McCorkle, Sammet, and Vaux--the deanship of a college or school; McCorkle and Sammet--the vice-chancellorship of a campus; and Clodius and McCorkle--the vice-presidency of a university.

The postwar graduate program was built upon the solid start made under the leadership of Tolley and Alsberg. It continued to grow in prestige and number of students under the successive leaderships of Bressler, Mehren, and Sammet.

Chall: Were you also responsible for teaching agricultural economics on the Davis campus?

Wellman: Yes, at that time there was one Department of Agricultural Economics with responsibilities on three campuses of the University--Berkeley, Davis, and Los Angeles. In 1966 the Davis department was separated from the Berkeley department, and the work at Los Angeles was discontinued around that time.

The problem of fulfilling our teaching responsibilities on the Davis campus after the war was substantial. That campus had been entirely closed to undergraduate instruction during the war, and our prewar teaching staff in agricultural economics (all but one of whom were temporary appointees) had left. The only ladder faculty member, Assistant Professor Roy Smith, had been transferred to UCLA to teach service courses in farm management and agricultural marketing to students majoring in subtropical horticulture and in floriculture and ornamental horticulture. In addition to providing degree courses in agricultural economics, we also had to teach nondegree courses to students in the two-year curriculum in agriculture. Also, we taught the degree course in elementary economics until the College of Letters and Science was established.
Wellman: Our goal at Davis was to recruit a highly qualified faculty equal in all respects to those at Berkeley but with a greater leaning toward undergraduate teaching. That could not, of course, be accomplished overnight. For several years, we had to fill in with temporary appointees. Gradually, we built a first-rate faculty fully capable of offering an undergraduate major in agricultural economics. Graduate offerings came later.

The transfer of Voorhies and Tinley from Berkeley to Davis, which was entirely voluntary on their part, added a good deal of strength to our teaching program there and enhanced the department's prestige throughout the Davis campus.

By the time I left the foundation-department in July, 1952, the agricultural economics staff at Davis consisted of eight faculty members, five nonacademic staff members, and two teaching assistants. That staff was larger than the staff of the Department of Agricultural Economics at Berkeley before the advent of the Giannini Foundation.

Chall: You said earlier that, under the provisions of the gift, Giannini Foundation funds were to be used for research and extension. Were other University funds also used for research and extension in Agricultural Economics?

Wellman: Yes, state and federal funds appropriated to the University. Expenditures for Agricultural Extension were administered by the Agricultural Extension Service, expenditures for research by the departments in the College of Agriculture under the auspices of its Agricultural Experiment Station. Faculty members in agricultural economics, as in other departments of the college, held titles in the Agricultural Experiment Station and received part of their salaries from funds earmarked for research in agriculture.

The year the Giannini Foundation was established, expenditures of department funds for research in agricultural economics were perhaps $25,000. Annual income from the Giannini Foundation endowment during the first few years was around $40,000. Thus, total funds available for research in agricultural economics were greatly increased. Only a small part of foundation income was used for Agricultural Extension, and that was phased out after a few years.
Wellman: Shortly after the end of the war, Dean Hutchison promoted a large increase in state funds for agricultural research and extension.

Chall: In his Oral History, Hutchison said that, while he suggested the need for additional funds for agricultural research and extension, the California Farm Bureau Federation was the prime mover in getting the state legislature and the governor to appropriate the funds.

Wellman: That may well have been the case, but I think Dean Hutchison was too modest about the role he played. As I recall, he initiated the proposal and, I suspect, sold it to President Sproul, the Regents, the directors of the California Farm Bureau Federation and the directors of the Agricultural Council of California.

In any event, in 1945 the state legislature authorized the creation of an Agricultural Research Study Committee to obtain and evaluate information on the need for additional funds for agricultural research and extension. The committee members were appointed by Governor Warren. After extensive hearings throughout the various agricultural areas of the state, the committee recommended a substantial increase in state appropriations to the University for agricultural research and extension, which I believe were made by the legislature and the governor in 1946-47 and 1947-48.

The Department of Agricultural Economics shared in the increased state appropriation. The total budget for the department (Berkeley, Davis, and Los Angeles combined) grew from less than $100,000 in 1945-46 to over $300,000 in 1951-52. The number of academic positions more than doubled; and there were corresponding increases in the number of nonacademic positions and in funds for general assistance, supplies, expense, equipment, and facilities.

On the other hand, the income of the Giannini Foundation endowments remained virtually stationary at around $40,000-$42,000. Later on, the various endowment funds were allocated their proportionate share of the earnings of the University Endowment Pool and, as a result, the Giannini Foundation allocation rose substantially. But even with that increase, the contribution of the Giannini Foundation income to total expenditures on research in agricultural economics was much less than before the war.
Wellman: Another source of increased funds for agricultural research was the appropriations under the Federal Research and Marketing Act approved by Congress in 1946. These funds had to be used for regional research, and 20 percent of them had to be used for regional marketing research. Since most of the research in other departments of the colleges of agriculture could scarcely be classified as marketing research, although there was some stretching of projects, most of the 20 percent earmarked for marketing was assigned to departments of agricultural economics.

In the University of California, the regional research funds were not regularly budgeted since the amount coming to us the next year was uncertain. The distribution among the states varied somewhat from time to time. As a member of the Western States Regional Committee on Agricultural Economics which allocated the Research and Marketing Act funds earmarked for agricultural economics research--mostly marketing research--among the western states, I deliberately sought a smaller allocation for California than could have been justified on any formula basis in order to help build up the research capability of other states. Also, I did not want to depend on funds which were subject to reallocation from year to year to pay the salaries of permanent staff members. Consequently, all regional research funds assigned to our department were used for general assistance, supplies, and expense.

Chall: You have mentioned that you did quite a bit of teaching in the postwar years. Did you do much research?

Wellman: Not much as evidenced by my list of publications during those years. If I had had to depend upon that limited research record for promotion to full professor, I might not have made it. Of course, much of my time was taken up with other duties--teaching, administration, and University and public service.

When I became the director of the Giannini Foundation and the chairman of the Department of Agricultural Economics, they were not as widely and fairly known by the agricultural interests of the state as I thought they could and should be. Not much could be done to correct that situation during the war. But when the war was over, I made a special effort to expand the research and public service activities of the foundation-department.
Wellman: I encouraged the faculty of the foundation-department to engage in research of potentially practical importance to the state's farmers and agribusinesses. The total research output of the foundation-department during the postwar years was impressive. My one regret is that I did not promote a series on fruit and vegetable studies similar to the Stanford Food Research Institute's wheat studies.

I personally spent quite a bit of time out in the state meeting with various agricultural groups and speaking at many of their meetings. In fact I did almost as much Agricultural Extension work as I had done when I was a member of the Agricultural Extension Service. There were few, if any, marketing control programs on California fruits and vegetables that I was not involved with in one way or another--some more, some less.

Some Background of the Giannini Foundation

Chall: You said that, when you were appointed director, the Giannini Foundation was not as widely and fairly known throughout the state as you thought it could and should be. Why was that?

Wellman: There were several reasons, I think.

In the first place, the foundation was slow in getting underway. The Regents accepted the gift in February, 1928, but it wasn't until July, 1930, that the first faculty members reported for duty. Howard R. Tolley, Murray Benedict, James Tinley, and George Peterson all came at that time. Professor Benedict became one of the most eminent scholars of the foundation-department.

As I have already mentioned, Claude B. Hutchison was the first director of the Giannini Foundation. He was appointed October 1, 1928. He was a geneticist by training--not an agricultural economist--and, hence did not personally engage in research and extension in agricultural economics, the purposes for which the Giannini Foundation was established.

Chall: Why then do you suppose that Hutchison was appointed director of the Giannini Foundation?
Wellman: I really don't know. I can only guess. My guess is that the then president of the University, William Wallace Campbell, felt that the Giannini Foundation required a full-time administrator, at least in its early years, and that Hutchison—who had demonstrated a substantial administrative ability as director of the University Farm School at Davis in 1922-1924 and had in that position become familiar with the agriculture of the state—would be a good choice. Whether any of the outstanding agricultural economists of that day—such as John D. Black, Joseph S. Davis, Benjamin H. Hibbard, Edwin G. Nourse, or Henry C. Taylor—were considered for the position, I do not know.

Hutchison's contributions as director of the Giannini Foundation were chiefly in helping plan the interior of Giannini Hall and in recruiting four faculty members, namely, Murray R. Benedict, George M. Peterson, James Tinley, and Howard R. Tolley. They all commenced work July 1, 1930, two years and four months after the Giannini Foundation gift was accepted by the Regents.

Benedict, Peterson, and Tinley had taken graduate work under John D. Black and had been recommended for appointment to the foundation by him. Tolley had first been appointed assistant director of the Giannini Foundation (July 1, 1930). He became director of the foundation a year later (July 1, 1931) after John D. Black had finally decided to remain at Harvard instead of coming to California.

When Hutchison was appointed dean of the college of agriculture in January, 1930, he tried to recruit John D. Black as his successor as director of the Giannini Foundation. Black, who would have been an excellent choice, was apparently tempted by the offer. At least he took a long time to decide not to accept it. Fortunately, Tolley was already on the job and was well qualified to fill the position.

In addition to the slow start, the Giannini Foundation labored under the handicap of acting directors for more than one-half of the time between 1930 and 1942. I have already mentioned that Tolley was on leave of absence from the University (from the spring of 1933 until his resignation in the spring of 1936) and that Alsberg served as director for only three years and one month (from October 1, 1937, until his untimely death on October 31, 1940). From the spring of
Wellman: 1933 until the fall of 1937 and from the fall of 1940 until the spring of 1942, when I was appointed director, the foundation was administered by acting directors.

Let me hasten to add that Hutchison was a great dean of the College of Agriculture--probably the greatest dean that the College of Agriculture has ever had. He served in that capacity from January 1, 1930, until his retirement July 1, 1952. I have great admiration and respect and warm affection for him.

Chall: You have written that government agricultural programs should be economically sound, administratively practical, legally enforceable, and politically acceptable. That sounds like a large order. Did you ever rub your head in anguish when the various programs failed to live up to those conditions?

Wellman: No, I do not recall that I did. I recognized that economic soundness, administrative practicability, and even legal enforceability were frequently considered less important by the lawmakers than political acceptability. After all, most laws are compromises; agricultural policy legislation is no exception.

Academic Senate and Other Committee Appointments

Chall: What other activities do you want to discuss relating to this decade?

Wellman: Perhaps I should say something about my service on Academic Senate committees. I learned a good deal about the University beyond agriculture by serving on such committees, especially the Budget Committee; and I widened materially my acquaintance with faculty members throughout the Berkeley campus.

The Academic Senate committees on which I served (the Academic Senate office provided this information) were:

- Welfare Committee, 1943-44 and 1944-45 (2 years)
- Budget Committee, 1945-46 through 1948-49 (4 years)
- Committee on Committees, 1947-48 and 1948-49 (2 years)
- Committee on Privilege and Tenure, 1951-52 (1 year)
Wellman: The Budget Committee was the most time consuming and also the most informative. During the four years I was on it, the members must have devoted nearly one-half time to its work during the months of January through April and considerable time during the other months. There was a substantial increase in enrollment during those years and many new faculty appointments had to be made, all of which were evaluated by the Budget Committee and by the ad hoc committees appointed by the Budget Committee.

Chall: Did you, when recommending on appointments and promotions, actually deal with the people who had been recommended for appointment or promotion?

Wellman: No, we did not interview them personally, although many of those recommended for promotion were known to at least one member of the Budget Committee. Also, it was fairly common for a prospective appointee to visit the campus and quite often would meet a member of the Budget Committee. Mainly, however, we relied on written documentations and we, in turn, would make our recommendation to the president in writing.

Chall: How large was your Budget Committee?

Wellman: Five members at that time.

Chall: Small.

Wellman: Yes. However, the Budget Committee had the help of a large number of faculty members. A separate ad hoc committee was appointed by the Budget Committee (formally appointed by the president on the recommendation of the Budget Committee, but I do not recall a single instance where the president departed from the Budget Committee's nominations) for each candidate--assistant professor or above--recommended for appointment or promotion. The ad hoc committee, after reviewing the available evidence some of which it secured itself by correspondence or telephone, prepared a comprehensive written report. I remember a few occasions when we sent an ad hoc committee report back for more adequate documentation and evaluation.

We also reviewed the budget requests of the departments for non-academic staff, supplies, expense, equipment, facilities, and made recommendations on them. But I never felt that these were particularly useful for the simple reason that we did not have an adequate basis on which to judge the comparative needs.
Chall: What was the Committee on Committees?

Wellman: It was the body elected by the members of the Academic Senate who appointed all of the other committees. It had a very important responsibility but did not require a lot of time.

Chall: The Committee on Privilege and Tenure in 1951-52 (the year you served on it) was a rather important committee I should think.

Wellman: It is an important committee. But I do not recall any cases coming before it when I was a member. The loyalty oath cases—those of the nonsigners—had all been handled by the previous committee. I became vice-president—agricultural sciences at the end of my first year on the Committee on Privilege and Tenure and, hence, was not eligible to continue.

Chall: Were you on University committees other than those of the Academic Senate?

Wellman: Yes, quite a few, but I do not think I remember them all.

One of the most interesting administrative committees that I was on was the Rangeland Utilization Committee appointed by Dean Hutchison right after the war. Several of the most prestigious faculty members on the Davis campus were also members of that committee—George Hart, chairman of the Department of Animal Husbandry; Ben Madson, director of Agricultural Field Stations; Tracy Storer, chairman of the Department of Zoology, and Frank Veihmeyer, chairman of the Department of Irrigation.

The main problem before the committee was that of clearing the brush that had taken over or was taking over rangelands. Since much of the rangeland in California is in national forests, the U.S. Forest Service had the say so on what was done on those lands. At that time, the U.S. Forest Service was adamantly opposed to any brush burning. The members of our committee were generally in favor of burning, some to a greater extent than others. Many discussions were held with the U.S. Forest Service personnel, mostly on technical issues about which I knew very little. Hence, I mainly listened.

Several experimental burns were made while I was on the committee; just how successful they were, I do not know. I understand that the U.S. Forest Service now undertakes limited burning under carefully controlled conditions. This is an example of extreme positions that were held by some on both sides which gave way to a closer middle ground.
Development of the Davis and Riverside Campuses

Wellman: Another administrative committee appointed by Dean Hutchison, on which I served, recommended the establishment of a College of Letters and Science on the Davis campus. Up to that time, quite a few courses in the letters and science areas had been offered on the Davis campus under the auspices of the College of Agriculture. Several of the usual letters and science departments were units in the College of Agriculture--botany, chemistry, English, history, mathematics, physics, political science, and zoology. Dean Hutchison felt, and the committee agreed with him, that instruction and research in agriculture would benefit from the existence on the same campus of strong departments in the disciplines undergirding agriculture.

I was also a member of the committee that recommended the establishment of an undergraduate liberal arts college on the Riverside campus. The aim was not to undergird instruction in agriculture--no instruction in agriculture was being offered nor was any contemplated--but rather to create a "Swarthmore of the West" where undergraduate instruction of the highest quality in the liberal arts would be preeminent.

That goal was rapidly being accomplished under the able leadership of Gordon Watkins, the first provost of the Riverside campus. And it would have been fully accomplished long before now under Watkins' successor, Herman T. Spieth, had there not been a change in policy recommended by President Kerr and approved by the Regents to turn the Riverside campus into a general university campus. The primary reason for the change was to help the University meet the projected increase in its enrollment during the 1960s and 1970s. Also, keeping the Riverside campus as a small liberal arts college would have been contrary to the spirit of the state's Master Plan for Higher Education which the University had sponsored.

Incidentally, as vice-president of the University, I had fully and enthusiastically concurred in turning Riverside into a general campus. At the time, the available projections on University enrollment clearly indicated that large expansion of the Riverside campus would be needed. The facts that total University enrollment, thus far in the 1970s, has fallen considerably short of the early projections and that enrollment on the Riverside campus, after rising markedly during the 1960s,
Wellman: turned downward do not, I think, prove that the decision to abandon the concept of a small liberal arts college was wrong. The mistake, if there was one, was to adopt the policy that all campuses of the University, except San Francisco, should eventually develop into a general campus with graduate programs in all areas.

Chall: You did not think that was the right policy?

Wellman: Well, I thought it was the right policy at the time. And, if the enrollment projections contained in the University's growth plan issued in 1965 had been realized, it would have turned out to be a good policy. But those enrollment projections were not materialized. They were substantially reduced in the University's revised growth plan issued in 1971. I was chairman of the Task Force that prepared that report. I will have more to say about it when we come to my postretirement activities.

Institute of Industrial Relations

Chall: Any other administrative committee assignments during the years you were director of the Giannini Foundation?

Wellman: Perhaps I should mention my service as chairman of the Faculty Advisory Committee of the Berkeley Campus Institute of Industrial Relations. I served in that capacity from the time the institute was started in 1945 until I became vice-president--agricultural sciences in 1952. Clark Kerr was director of the institute during those years, and I became well acquainted with him and came to have the highest regard for him both professionally and personally.

Incidentally, I was a member of the committee, under the chairmanship of Professor E.T. Grether, which advised President Sproul on the organization and role of the Berkeley Campus Institute of Industrial Relations (an Institute of Industrial Relations was also established on the Los Angeles campus with more emphasis on extension and less emphasis on research); and I was also a member of the ad hoc faculty committee which recommended the appointment of Kerr as director of the Berkeley Campus Institute. I also might mention that I was a member of Kerr's qualifying examination committee for the Ph.D. degree
Wellman: (he passed with flying colors), and one time I served for two months as acting director of the Institute of Industrial Relations.

Recollections of the Loyalty Oath Controversy

Chall: Were you involved in the loyalty oath controversy?

Wellman: Yes, but only to a small extent. I did not take a major part in that tragic affair. In fact, I played only a minor role. I do not remember too much about it.

Chall: But you were a member of the Committee of Five along with Edward Strong, Clark Kerr, R.A. Gordon, and H.B. Gotaas.

Wellman: Yes, that committee held quite a few meetings, but I do not remember all that we did. The one thing I remember well is that I presented to the Academic Senate, Northern Division, on behalf of the committee, a proposal for the establishment of a Special Committee on Academic Freedom. It was approved. That was the extent of my speaking part on the stage, and I suspect about the extent of my influence on the whole sad affair. Incidentally, the Special Committee on Academic Freedom was later established as a standing committee. Maybe it was the only good thing that came out of the loyalty oath.

I left 1950.

Chall: When you left, the situation was still tense. How did you feel about going off to Europe? You did not feel like "the rat deserting the ship" or any of those things?

Wellman: No, that never occurred to me. I had made all arrangements for sabbatical leave quite a while before. California had lost its pre-World War II markets for dried fruits in Europe, and I thought it was important to explore the possibilities of regaining them. Also, I wanted to see Europe. It was my first sabbatical leave--long postponed--and, incidentally, also my last. Then, too, it seemed to me that the oath controversy was on the way to being settled. Agreement had been reached within the faculty that the Academic Senate Committee on Privilege and Tenure would hear the cases of nonsigners and
Wellman: report to the president its findings. I had assumed along with many other members of the faculty that, if the Committee on Privilege and Tenure found that a nonsigner was not a Communist, he would not be dismissed. And so I left for Europe quite relaxed.

Chall: Then you were not here when a majority of the Regents refused to accept the recommendation of the Committees on Privilege and Tenure and voted to dismiss the nonsigners?

Wellman: I did not return until the end of the year (December, 1950), and by that time the matter was before the court.

Chall: You did not hear of the Regents' action until you returned?

Wellman: I heard of it before I returned. Sidney Hoos, who was serving as acting director-chairman of the Giannini Foundation, had sent me clippings from the San Francisco Chronicle. So I knew that the nonsigners had been dismissed.

Chall: What was your reaction?

Wellman: Well, I was naturally disappointed, but I did not learn of the basis for their dismissal until after I returned. When I did, I was shocked. It had seemed inconceivable to me that the majority of the members of the governing board of a great university would vote to fire a faculty member whose loyalty to this country was never in doubt simply because he refused to sign an oath that he was not a Communist. Yet, that was what happened.

Perhaps I should explain that I had felt that the nonsigners were naive in refusing to sign the Regents' loyalty oath. I personally had no problem in signing the oath. I was not a Communist or a Communist sympathizer, and I was perfectly willing to say so and to say so under oath. Why anyone would refuse to was beyond me. At the same time, I could not condone firing a known non-Communist simply because he felt that he should not, for whatever reason, sign an oath that he was not.

Also, I should say that some of the tactics of the nonsigners were, in my view, inexcusable. I well remember the Academic Senate meeting when, after long debate, two resolutions which had rejected were reintroduced and passed after most of the faculty members who had opposed them had left the meeting.
Chall: Was there much tension among the faculty during the period?

Wellman: Yes, as I recall, there was some. Maybe more developed while I was in Europe. But most of the faculty in agriculture went right ahead with their work, and I suspect that this was true throughout much of the University. For one thing, the controversy did not involve students, so there were no rallies, marches, sit-ins, or vandalism. As compared with the free speech period of the 1960s, the Berkeley campus was a quiet and decorous place during the oath controversy.

Chall: It is generally thought the reason the loyalty oath came up at all was because Mr. Corley felt that the legislature would not provide the University with the budget that it needed unless a loyalty oath was signed by the faculty. From your knowledge of the agricultural people, who it is claimed controlled the legislature at that time, did you think this was a valid assumption on the part of the administration?

Wellman: It proved not to be. The legislature did not pass a loyalty oath requirement in the 1949 session.

Corley was mistaken in his appraisal of the situation. But I am sure that he recommended the imposition of a faculty oath with the best of intentions. He had the responsibility for getting the University's budget request approved by the legislature; and he apparently felt that, with the strong anti-Communist sentiment prevailing at the time, a faculty loyalty oath would be viewed favorably by members of the legislature.

Chall: That period was, of course, the heyday of the McCarthy thinking. Did you find your friends in agriculture saying, "What's going on at the University? Is there a radical bunch up there? Are they Communists?"

Wellman: I do not recall that matter ever coming up in the groups I was working with.

Chall: I came across the fact that you had written a character reference for Walter Packard when he was fired from the ECA while in Greece in about 1950, so I assume that you did not consider that everybody who was thought to be a Communist was a Communist in those days—as many others did.
Wellman: That is right; I did not feel that all those who had different ideas than mine were Communists. At the same time, I was in entire accord with the Regents' policy of excluding members of the Communist party from membership in the faculty of the University. I felt then that a bona fide member of the Communist party had to follow the Communist party line and, hence, could not be unbiased in his teaching. (The Gulag Archipelago by Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, which I have read since our interviews were finished, seemed to me fully to confirm that judgment.)

Chall: What about the faculty's opinions of President Sproul at the time? Did they know what role he had played in the loyalty oath, and were they upset by it?

Wellman: I really cannot say. My impression is that few faculty members knew in the beginning that President Sproul had recommended to the Regents the adoption of a loyalty oath; at least, I did not. By the time I learned of the part he had played--and I suspect that this was the case with many other faculty members--he had reversed his position. I did not hear among the faculty members with whom I was most closely associated, mainly in agriculture, any comments that President Sproul should resign. There was some feeling that he had not been as forthright as he should have been.

Chall: What was the situation among the Regents?

Wellman: Apparently, very bitter, but I did not know that at the time. I knew, of course, that there were sharp differences of opinion among them; but I did not know, until after I became vice-president of agricultural sciences in 1952, just how deep-seated the antagonism between several of the Regents had become or how great the hostility of some of them toward President Sproul was.

The bitterness among several of the Regents that grew out of the loyalty oath is illustrated by an incident that occurred at a board meeting on the Davis campus. Regents John Francis Neylan, who was sitting at one end of the table, and Jesse H. Steinhart, who was sitting near the other end, got into a hot dispute; over what, I don't now recall. Their tempers flared; they both got up at the same time and started toward each other. Regent Gus Olsen, who was quite a bit larger than either Neylan or Steinhart and who feared that they might come to blows, stepped in between them. Neyland and Steinhart returned to their seats.
Wellman: Regent John Francis Neylan, in particular, had become an outspoken foe of President Sproul. He was the prime mover in calling a special meeting of the Regents in June, 1953, which stopped the transfer of the Regents Retiring Annuities System to the State Employees Retirement System, although the Regents had previously approved the transfer in principle and the faculty had voted overwhelmingly for the transfer. Neylan's opposition, along with those who had joined him in calling the special meeting, was based upon the fact that Sproul would receive a substantially higher retirement income under the State Retirement System.

The action of the majority of the Regents that day, led by Regent Neylan out of malice toward President Sproul, has resulted in a substantial loss in retirement income for nearly all faculty members who have retired since that time.

Chall: Well, I think we have pretty well discussed the loyalty oath. I just wasn't going to let you get away with simply telling me you'd gone to Europe.

Wellman: My last administrative committee assignment, while I was still in the foundation-department, was as chairman of a special committee appointed by President Sproul to consider "improvements in the form of the annual budget of the University and in the procedures for its preparation and presentation to the Regents."
IV VICE-PRESIDENT--AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES, 1952-1958

Chall: In 1952 there was a major reorganization of the University, and you became vice-president of agricultural sciences. How do you think you were given this position? Who appointed you?

Wellman: President Sproul offered me the position. He told me that the Regents had approved my appointment on his recommendation and that he was pleased that Regent A.J. McFadden, at that time chairman of the Regents Committee on Agriculture, had made the motion that I be appointed. McFadden was an ex-officio Regent by virtue of his position as president of the State Board of Agriculture. Governor Warren had appointed him to that position. Sometime afterward I learned that an ad hoc committee appointed by President Sproul under the chairmanship of Gordon Watkins, formerly professor of economics at UCLA and at that time provost of the Riverside campus, had recommended my appointment.

Under the reorganization of 1952, the Regents had established the title Chancellor for the chief campus officers of the Berkeley and Los Angeles campuses and the title Provost for the chief campus officers of the smaller campuses. After Clark Kerr became president in 1958, the Regents, on his recommendation, established the title Chancellor for the chief executive officer of all University campuses.

It is my impression that there had been a growing desire among the Regents living in Southern California that UCLA should have more autonomy. Several Regents from Northern California felt that the Berkeley campus should be accorded the same degree of independence as UCLA.

There was also a feeling among at least some of the Regents that administration of the College of Agriculture was too highly centralized under Dean Hutchison.
Reorganization of the College of Agriculture

Chall: Did the reorganization of the University result in decentralization of agriculture?

Wellman: Yes, to some extent. My first job after taking office was to reorganize the administration of agriculture so that it would fit into the newly established organizational plan of the University. That plan provided for chief campus officers with substantial administrative authority.

From 1930 when he became president of the University until 1952, Sproul served as chief campus officer of the Berkeley campus as well as president of the University. Dean Hutchison reported directly to him on Berkeley campus matters as well as on all other matters relating to agriculture.

The Los Angeles campus was headed by a provost or an Interim Administrative Committee from 1931 until 1952, but neither had much authority. Sproul was in fact the chief campus officer of UCLA. Hutchison, as dean of the statewide College of Agriculture, reported directly to Sproul on Los Angeles campus matters relating to agriculture and largely bypassed the provosts.

Gordon Watkins was appointed provost of the Riverside campus in 1949. He reported to Hutchison who had in 1946 been given the additional appointment of vice-president of the University. I suppose that Watkins reported to Hutchison in his (Hutchison's) capacity as vice-president of the University rather than in his capacity as dean of the College of Agriculture.

For several years after his appointment, Watkins's time was fully occupied with developing a liberal arts college from the ground up—a physical plan and construction of buildings and an academic plan and recruiting faculty. At that stage he had little time for administrative matters concerning the Citrus Experiment Station at Riverside. The director of the station, Alfred M. Boyce, continued to report directly to the dean of the College of Agriculture until Hutchison retired (1952).

Dean Hutchison served as chief campus officer of the Davis campus with respect to academic matters, including those of the College of Letters and Science established in 1951; and on those matters he reported directly to President Sproul. James H. Corley,
Wellman: vice-president of business affairs, was really the chief
campus officer of each of the campuses with respect to all
business matters. The business manager on each campus
reported directly to him. He had a tightly knit, highly
centralized operation.

Chall: Was it an efficient operation, do you think?

Wellman: I really don't know. My impression is that, from the standpoint
of keeping expenses down, it was. But from the standpoint of
servicing the academic departments, I'm not so sure. I heard
quite a few complaints from department chairmen, especially
in purchasing supplies and equipment.

The instance I remember most clearly had to do with the
purchase of a bean harvester for the Department of Agronomy
on the Davis campus. In its research on bean varieties,
cultivation practices, etc., that department regularly planted
many different plots to beans. It felt that its research
would be greatly facilitated by harvesting the plots with a
modified commercial bean harvester, and the request was strongly
supported by Fred N. Briggs who had been chairman of the
Department of Agronomy and who was then dean of the College of
Agriculture. Funds for the purchase were in the approved
budget. However, the business manager of the Davis campus,
Ira Smith, refused to process the purchase order on the grounds
that the acreage to be harvested was too small to justify the
cost of a bean harvester. He was undoubtedly thinking of
commercial plantings, not experimental plantings; large fields,
not numerous small plots.

I appealed his decision to Corley. Corley refused to
change it, more I felt from the standpoint of upholding his
business manager than from the soundness of the decision itself.
I thought of appealing the decision to Sproul but then decided
instead to try again the next year. This we did, and the next
year the purchase of the bean harvester was recommended by
Smith and approved by Corley; but in the meantime the cost had
gone up about 10 percent, and I had to provide the additional
money from my emergency fund.

My view then, and I never changed it, was that the duty
of the University was not to save money but rather to spend
wisely whatever amount was made available to it.

I fear I've strayed a bit.
Chall: We were talking about the organization of agriculture under Dean Hutchison and how it was effected by the reorganization of the University.

Wellman: As I said, or at least implied, Dean Hutchison reported directly to President Sproul on all matters relating to agriculture. Hutchison had an assistant dean on each campus on which undergraduate instruction in agriculture was offered—Stanley B. Freeborn at Berkeley, Knowles A. Ryerson at Davis, and Robert W. Hodgson at Los Angeles. How much authority the assistant deans had, I am not certain. My impression is that they were concerned primarily with undergraduate instruction. As chairman of the Department of Agricultural Economics on the Berkeley, Davis and Los Angeles campuses, I had little official contact with them. I discussed appointments and budgets directly with Dean Hutchison and research projects directly with Paul F. Sharp, director of the Agricultural Experiment Station.

The Hutchison Reorganization Plan, 1949

Wellman: In a letter to President Sproul, dated June 3, 1949, Dean Hutchison proposed the creation of a Division of Agriculture in the University. Copies of the letter were sent to the assistant deans and directors in the College of Agriculture. As director of the Giannini Foundation, I received a copy. I must confess that I did not pay much attention to it. At the time, I had no thought that I might ever become involved with it. Verne A. Stadtman's comments in his History of the University of California (page 358) recalled Hutchison's proposal to my mind.

Chall: Was the plan Dean Hutchison proposed significantly different from the one that was adopted in 1952 when you became vice-president—agricultural sciences?

Wellman: Yes, I think so; and based on several conversations I had with Dean Hutchison after he retired, I am confident that he would agree that his proposed plan was significantly different from the one President Sproul recommended and the Regents adopted. He told me that he thought his plan was the better of the two from the standpoint of agriculture in the University.
The Hutchison plan called for the continuation of the existing College of Agriculture with some changes. The assistant deans of the College of Agriculture at Berkeley, Davis, and Los Angeles would become deans of their respective sections of the Faculty of Agriculture and, in addition, would be designated assistant directors of the Agricultural Experiment Station. In their capacity as dean of the Faculty of Agriculture, they would report to the Collegewide Director of Resident Instruction (a new position) who, in turn, would report to the dean of the College of Agriculture. In their capacity as assistant director of the Agricultural Experiment Station, they would report to the director of the Agricultural Experiment Station who, in turn, would report to the dean of the College of Agriculture.

Theoretically, the dean of the College of Agriculture would report to the vice-president of the University who, in turn, would report to the president of the University. Actually the dean of the College of Agriculture would continue to report directly to the president of the University since, under the Hutchison plan, the same individual would be both the dean of the College of Agriculture and the vice-president of the University. At that time Hutchison held both of those positions. In order to insure further centralized control of the University's agricultural activities, the individual serving as vice-president of the University and as dean of the College of Agriculture would also serve as provost of the Davis campus.

The Hutchison plan also provided that the Colleges of Letters and Science at both Davis and Riverside would be units of the Division of Agriculture. Thus, at Davis the dean of the College of Letters and Science would report to the provost of the Davis campus who would also be the vice-president of the University. At Riverside the dean of the College of Letters and Science would report to the provost of the Riverside campus who, in turn, would report to the vice-president of the University who, as I have indicated, would also be the provost of the Davis campus and the dean of the statewide College of Agriculture.

The director of the Citrus Experiment Station at Riverside is shown in Hutchison's organizational chart as reporting both to the director of the Agricultural Experiment Station and the provost of the Riverside campus. On the other hand, the individuals in charge of the agricultural activities on the Berkeley and Los Angeles campuses appear to bypass the heads of those campuses.
At the time Dean Hutchison proposed his plan for the organization and administration of the Division of Agriculture (June, 1949), it was contemplated that both the Davis and Riverside campuses would remain relatively small institutions—Davis eventually to have an enrollment of 3,500 students, and Riverside eventually to have an enrollment of 1,500 students. If student enrollments had been stabilized at those levels, Hutchison's proposal that the vice-president of the University in charge of agriculture, the dean of the statewide College of Agriculture, and the provost of the Davis campus be the same person and that the provost of the Riverside campus report to the president of the University through the vice-president in charge of agriculture would, I think, have been administratively feasible.

The provost of the Davis campus and the provost of the Riverside campus did report to the president of the University through the vice-president--agricultural sciences until 1958. However, that arrangement was terminated, as it had to be, when the Regents approved in 1958 a change in the character of those campuses from relatively small specialized campuses to potentially large general campuses.

Chall: Why do you suppose the Regents did not approve the Hutchison plan?

Wellman: I cannot say for sure. I have not gone back and read the minutes of the meeting of the Regents' committee on agriculture at which that matter may have been discussed. Perhaps I should, and maybe I will some day. Until I do, I can only speculate.

First, let me say that I do not think it was because of any lack of confidence in Hutchison's administrative ability. Rather, I suspect, it was due to the Regent's determination to decentralize the administration of the University and their feeling that agriculture should conform to that policy.

That suspicion was supported by a number of statements which President Sproul made at the time he offered me the position of vice-president--agricultural sciences. I asked him whether I would also be appointed dean of the College of Agriculture. He said no. Then he showed me a letter from a prominent member of the Regents' committee on agriculture which stated that agriculture was too tightly controlled by one man and should be decentralized.
Sproul also told me that the provost of the Davis campus would report through the vice-president--agricultural sciences and that he (Sproul) would like to have Stanley Freeborn appointed provost of the Davis campus. Thus, Sproul notified me that the person who had the title vice-president--agricultural sciences would not also have the titles dean of the College of Agriculture and provost of the Davis campus. I also suspect, although Sproul did not say so explicitly, that the Regents were unwilling to have the chief administrative officers of the Berkeley and Los Angeles campuses largely bypassed with respect to the agricultural activities on those campuses.

It is my impression that Hutchison felt that agriculture should be gradually phased out on both the Los Angeles and Berkeley campuses. I came to agree with him as far as the Los Angeles campus was concerned and started the move while I was still vice-president--agricultural sciences. Also, I asked a committee of the Berkeley faculty, including some nonagriculture members, to give me its evaluation of the advantages and disadvantages of moving the agricultural activities being conducted on the Berkeley campus to the Davis campus. I expected the committee's report to be biased in favor of Berkeley, and it was.

Nevertheless, the reasons advanced for keeping at Berkeley a substantial amount of the agricultural sciences, such as entomology, genetics, plant pathology, plant nutrition, and soils, seemed to me to be sufficiently valid to justify their retention for at least through the 1960s. I therefore dropped any further consideration of the matter.

What do you think now?

Well, the situation seems to be changing. If the proposal to replace the existing College of Agricultural Sciences at Berkeley with a College of Natural Resources is adopted, and I suspect that it will be [the proposal was adopted and became effective July 1, 1974], there would appear to be little justification for retaining at Berkeley any mission-oriented research relating to the production and marketing of agricultural products.
The 1952 Reorganization Plan

Chall: What changes were made in agriculture under the 1952 reorganization.

Wellman: The old College of Agriculture was replaced by the Division of Agricultural Sciences. The Agricultural Extension Service and the Agricultural Experiment Station were taken out of the College of Agriculture and placed in the newly established Division of Agricultural Sciences. The new College of Agriculture had one mission, undergraduate instruction. It became a separate unit in the Division of Agricultural Sciences as did also the School of Forestry at Berkeley and the School of Veterinary Medicine at Davis.

I should perhaps explain that departments of instruction and research conducted undergraduate instruction under the auspices of the College of Agriculture and graduate instruction under the auspices of the graduate divisions.

The new College of Agriculture, while remaining one college, was more closely identified with the campus on which it offered instruction. Each of the three parts of the college was administered by a dean who reported to the chief campus officer. The positions of assistant dean in the old College of Agriculture were upgraded to that of dean.

Agricultural instruction on the three campuses--Berkeley, Davis, and Los Angeles--was coordinated by a college-wide executive committee composed of representatives from the three campuses. The deans--Briggs, Hodgson, and Ryerson--were members of this college-wide executive committee; and I, as vice-president of agricultural sciences, served as its chairman. There were also on the executive committee two faculty members from Berkeley, two from Davis, and one from Los Angeles.

The executive committee had as its major responsibility coordination of instruction so as to avoid unnecessary duplication on the one hand and neglect of important areas on the other. For example, there was little, if any, justification for an undergraduate major in agricultural economics on the Los Angeles campus. Service courses in farm management and agricultural marketing for students majoring in floriculture and ornamental horticulture and in subtropical horticulture were all that were needed.
Wellman: On the other hand, an undergraduate major in agricultural economics on the Davis campus, with emphasis on farm management and marketing, would fulfill a need that could not be met as well on the Berkeley campus because of the absence of complementary courses in agricultural production areas such as agronomy, animal husbandry, and pomology.

The problems of duplication of offerings among the campuses, especially in graduate programs is one that has plagued the University ever since a second general campus, UCLA, was established. I may have more to say about that later. For now, it is perhaps enough to observe that the problem has been handled better in agriculture than in most other areas.

Chall: Was there any greater need for coordination of research under the new setup?

Wellman: No, I don't think so. There was little change in research coordination when the Agricultural Experiment Station was removed from the College of Agriculture and made a separate unit in the Division of Agricultural Sciences. Faculty members still held appointments in the Agricultural Experiment Station and conducted their research under its auspices. They still submitted to the director of the Agricultural Experiment Station written project statements of the research to be undertaken, and they still submitted written annual reports summarizing the progress made and results achieved.

The director of the Agricultural Experiment Station still had the responsibility for seeing to it that research on one campus was not needlessly duplicated on another campus. This he could do by withholding approval of a research proposal if persuasion failed. He also still had the responsibility for uncovering problems on which more research was needed and for identifying problems which were no longer of much importance and on which research could be reduced or eliminated.

As far as the administration of agricultural research was concerned, the main change was in giving the individual on the campus holding the title of dean of the College of Agriculture the additional title of assistant director of the Agricultural Experiment Station. Just as the chairmen of agricultural departments had responsibility for both teaching and research, the heads of agriculture on the campuses were given responsibility for both teaching and research.
Wellman: All of the important matters relating to coordination of agricultural instruction, research, and extension were considered by the Agricultural Administration Committee of the Division of Agricultural Sciences before a decision was made. This committee consisted of the director of the Agricultural Experiment Station, the director of the Agricultural Extension Service, the deans of the College of Agriculture on the Berkeley, Davis, and Los Angeles campuses, and the director of the Citrus Experiment Station at Riverside. I served as chairman.

At that time joint departments at Berkeley-Davis and Los Angeles-Riverside were the rule; that is, for similar units such as entomology, plant pathology, and soils. The chairman of the department would be on one campus and the vice chairman on the other. Where there was a joint department in the north and another joint department in the south, the faculty of both departments would usually meet together once or twice a year.

Chall: I'm not sure that I understand what approvals were required on research projects. Did they have to be approved by the chief campus officer, the chancellor or provost?

Wellman: No, research projects were not submitted to the chief campus officer for his approval or disapproval. The line of approval was from the faculty member or from a group of faculty members to the chairman of the department, to the campus assistant director of the Agricultural Experiment Station, and to the statewide director of the Agricultural Experiment Station. The approval of the latter is mandatory for all research projects being supported in whole or in part by federal funds.

Chall: What about personnel actions? Did appointments, promotions, and salary increases of faculty members in agriculture require the approval of the chancellor or provost?

Wellman: Yes, to the same extent that personnel actions in other colleges and research institutes required his approval. The chief campus officer had final approval on most nonacademic personnel actions and, as I recall, on nontenure academic personnel actions subject to certain restraints. For example, an appointment could be made only if the position had been previously authorized.

Tenure personnel actions were recommended by the chief campus officer of the president; and he in turn decided what,
Wellman: if any, recommendations should be submitted to the Regents.

As vice-president-agricultural sciences, I reviewed for the president the recommendations of the chief campus officers on agricultural personnel actions and then added my own recommendation. Usually, I agreed with the campus recommendations, especially when they were unanimous, i.e., from the chairman of the department, the dean of the college-assistant director of the Agricultural Experiment Station, the Academic Senate Budget Committee, and the chief campus officer, but not always. In some instances the evidence did not seem to me to be sufficiently strong to justify the proposed appointment, promotion, or merit salary increase.

President Sproul may have reversed some of my recommendations which disagreed with those of the chief campus officers; but, if so, I don't remember them. I do recall several instances in which he questioned a proposed tenure appointment which had received unanimous approval all along the line, including my own. On several occasions he said to me, "Don't be satisfied with anything less than the best." I also remember his advice, "Go after a star of the first magnitude."

Chall: On the budget request of agricultural departments on a campus, did the chief campus officer pass on them especially when the proposed increase was mainly for research?

Wellman: Yes, budget requests in agriculture followed the same course as other budget requests.

Again, I reviewed for the president the campus budget requests for agriculture and made my own recommendations to him. When they involved research expansion or contraction, I consulted the director of the Agricultural Experiment Station. Actually, during the budget process and long before the campus budget request reached me, the director of the Agricultural Experiment Station had talked the issues over with the assistant director of the Agricultural Experiment Station on the campus and with the concerned department chairman; the assistant director had talked with the chief campus officer or with his budget officer; the director of the Agricultural Experiment Station had talked with me; and I had talked with the chief campus officer.

While there may not have been a full meeting of minds, there was a pretty good understanding on the part of all concerned as to the reasons for the budget request.
Growth of the Division of Agricultural Sciences

Wellman: During the six years I was vice-president--agricultural sciences, there was good support for the agricultural activities of the University by the president and the Regents, by the governor and the legislature, and by agricultural industry groups. In addition to increased state funds, the University also received increased federal funds for both agricultural research and Agricultural Extension.

The number of positions, academic and nonacademic combined, in the Division of Agricultural Sciences as a whole grew from 1,609 in 1952-53 to 2,162 in 1958-59, an increase of 34 percent. The relative increases in numbers of positions in agriculture on the campuses were: Berkeley--17 percent, Davis--49 percent, Los Angeles--27 percent, and Riverside--48 percent. The number of positions in the Agricultural Extension Service went up 28 percent, and those in agricultural field stations went up 41 percent.

It is evident that the administrative reorganization of the University did not adversely affect its agricultural activities during those years.

Chall: Was there any concern among the agricultural leaders of the state that the administrative reorganization of the University would adversely affect its service to agriculture?

Wellman: There was some, but how extensive it was, I don't know. That first year I accepted quite a few invitations to speak at meetings of farmers up and down the state and took advantage of the opportunity to explain the new setup and to express the conviction that the University's activities relating to agriculture would not be adversely affected.

President Sproul took two steps which helped to allay whatever apprehension that existed.

He had the provosts of the Davis and Riverside campuses report to him through me. By so doing he sought to assure the agricultural leaders of the state that the agricultural activities on those campuses would not be hampered. Freeborn and Watkins were entirely agreeable to that arrangement, and I worked closely with them on the development of all aspects of those two campuses, not just agriculture alone.
Chall: Why would the provosts of these two campuses be reporting to the vice-president--agricultural sciences rather than to some other vice-president?

Wellman: Two reasons. At that time the Davis and Riverside campuses were largely devoted to agriculture. The College of Letters and Science at Davis was just getting started. It had admitted its first student in 1951. The College of Letters and Science at Riverside didn't admit its first students until 1954. Secondly, there were only three vice-presidents in the University at that time, namely, the vice-president--business affairs, the vice-president--university extension, and the vice-president--agricultural sciences. If the provosts of the largely agricultural campuses were to report to any vice-president, it would logically be to the vice-president--agricultural sciences.

Chall: The chancellors of the Berkeley and Los Angeles campuses on which there was agricultural instruction and research reported directly to the president; why didn't the provosts of the Davis and Riverside campuses also do so?

Wellman: Agriculture constituted a much smaller part of the total campus activity at Berkeley and Los Angeles than at Davis and Riverside. Also, the farmers of the state tended to look to the Davis and Riverside campuses for solutions of the crop and livestock production problems confronting them.

Chall: How many members were there, and how were they chosen?

Wellman: Twenty-one members, I believe, with three-year staggered terms. They were appointed by President Sproul from nominations which I submitted after consultation with other members of the division administrative committee. We chose people from the several agricultural sections of the state and representing different crop and livestock interests.
Chall: Was the council helpful to you?

Wellman: Yes, it served as a sounding board where our ideas about changes in the operation of the division could be tested, and also the members provided useful comments of their own on how we might improve our operations. It was a two-way street.

Without reviewing the minutes of the meetings of the council (meetings were held twice a year), I could not tell you all of the things that were considered; but in addition to a discussion of the annual operating budget of the division, I do recall two important items. One was our proposal to discontinue the two-year nondegree curriculum in agriculture on the Davis campus. The other was our proposal to establish one or more agricultural field stations in the San Joaquin Valley.

Chall: I have seen the term "two-year nondegree curriculum," but I'm not sure I know exactly what it was.

Wellman: It was a two-year course in practical agriculture. The Davis campus was started as a farm school for boys interested in farming or in a closely related enterprise such as butter or cheese making. Many of the leading farmers of the state had graduated from the two-year curriculum. For many years after the admission of the first students in 1908, that curriculum had met a real need.

But by the mid-1950s its continuance could no longer be justified. The California Polytechnic College in San Luis Obispo was doing an excellent job in vocational agriculture and was able to provide instruction for all students who desired it. Also quite a few junior colleges were offering two-year terminal courses in agriculture. The two-year nondegree curriculum at Davis was terminated in 1960, but the decision to phase it out had been made while I was still vice-president--agricultural sciences. Several years' advance notice of termination had to be given so that students planning to enroll there would be able to make other arrangements.
Expanding the Agricultural Field Stations

Wellman: Another topic which was considered at length by the Agricultural Advisory Council was expansion of agricultural field stations, especially in the San Joaquin Valley.

Chall: What is an agricultural field station? You have mentioned the Agricultural Experiment Station. How does a field station differ from an experiment station?

Wellman: I'm not sure I can explain the difference to your satisfaction, I'll try.

The Agricultural Experiment Station is the official name of the University's unit for agricultural research. As I understand it, this name comes from the federal Hatch Act adopted by the U.S. Congress in 1887. That act provided funds for the establishment and operation of an agricultural experiment station in each state of the Union. In all states with one or two exceptions the agricultural experiment stations became a part of the states' colleges of agriculture, and, as far as I know, the name Agricultural Experiment Station was adopted by all states. The name might well have been Agricultural Research Institute, Agricultural Research Center, or Agricultural Research Service, or something similar. It consists of agricultural scientists together with supporting staff, physical facilities, equipment and supplies needed to carry on research.

An agricultural field station is an off-campus outdoor facility used for investigating problems of crop and livestock production which vary from area to area because of differences in the physical conditions affecting their production such as climate, soil, water, and topography.

California has a wide range of physical conditions affecting crop and livestock production--more than any other state and, probably, more than any four or five adjoining states.

Chall: How many agricultural field stations does the University have?

Wellman: I'll have to count them. Let's see.

When I became vice-president--agricultural sciences, we had two major ones--one in the Imperial Valley irrigated area near Holt and one in the north coast range area near Hopland.
We also had three minor field stations— one in the Antelope Valley; one at San Jose, now completely surrounded by houses; and one at Tule Lake in Siskiyou County. The Department of Horticulture at Davis had an experimental orchard near Winters, and the Department of Viticulture had an experimental vineyard near Napa. The Department of Animal Husbandry conducted some experiments with beef cattle on the San Joaquin Experimental Range in the foothills east of Turlock which is owned and operated by the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA). Limited experiments with cotton were also conducted by the University on a field station near Shafter in Kern County, also owned and operated by the USDA.

Much of the field research was on the Davis and Riverside campuses, both of which had large acreages acquired for that purpose.

Planning for a major agricultural field station in the south coast area of the state was under way when I took office. One was needed in that area for investigations which could not be conducted at Riverside because of climatic conditions or at Los Angeles because of land limitations.

At the time the Westwood location was selected for a University campus, the Regents had hoped to acquire 160 acres nearby from the U.S. Veteran's Administration to be used for agricultural research, but they didn't succeed in doing so.

In 1954 the Regents purchased two hundred acres near Tustin from the Irvine Land Company for an agricultural field station. It is excellent land and well located from the standpoint of easy access from both the Riverside and Los Angeles campuses.

With the acquisition of the South Coast Field Station, the main deficiency in off-campus sites for agricultural investigations was in the San Joaquin Valley. That great agricultural area which, in 1954, accounted for 40 percent of the state's agricultural income and which produced more agricultural income than each of twenty-five states in this country was without land, under University control, on which to conduct experiments on crops that were grown and which might be grown there.

Moreover, the California water plan would, when completed, bring under irrigation vast areas on the west side of the San Joaquin Valley. I felt that the University should have at least two major agricultural field stations in the San Joaquin Valley,
Wellman: one on the west side and one on the east side.

Up until 1948 the University owned over 5,000 acres of land a dozen miles west of the city of Fresno--a gift from M. Theodore Kearney who died in 1905. In his will, giving the land to the University together with $25,000 in cash, Mr. Kearney suggested that an experiment station be created on the land, that it be called the Kearney Experiment Station, and that it be an adjunct of the College of Agriculture. That was never done. Rather, the ranch was operated as a commercial enterprise. It was broken up into numerous parcels which were sold in 1948 and 1949.

Chall: Why wasn't that land used for an agricultural field station?

Wellman: I really don't know. Since the land had been sold before I had any responsibility for it, I haven't inquired into the reasons why it had not been used for field research. I heard it said that the soil was not representative of the soil of the San Joaquin Valley.

Chall: You did acquire other land for an agricultural field station in the San Joaquin Valley?

Wellman: Yes. As a matter of fact, the University now has three major agricultural field stations in the San Joaquin Valley--one on the west side of the Valley at Five Points about thirty miles west of Fresno and two on the east of the Valley. The Lindcove Field Station fifteen miles east of Visalia is a specialized station used primarily for citrus. Urban development in southern California was replacing many orange groves there, and large new plantings were being made in the San Joaquin Valley.

The Kearney Horticultural Field Station, named after M. Theodore Kearney, is located near Reedley. It has become a very important center for agricultural research in the San Joaquin Valley.

Establishment of the West Side Field Station and the Lindcove Field Station had been approved by the Regents while I was still vice-president--agricultural sciences. The Regents had also approved, in principle, the development of a major field station on the east side of the Valley for investigations relating to deciduous fruits, nuts, grapes and vegetables; but the first purchase of land was not made until 1961.
Wellman: I felt rather strongly that the Division of Agricultural Sciences should be represented in a significant way in the Fresno area; otherwise, the agricultural interests there might be tempted to turn to Fresno State College for the help they thought they wanted but could not get from the University.

Planning for the Sierra Foothill Range Field Station was started under my administration of the Division of Agricultural Sciences, but purchase of the land--5,700 acres--was not completed until 1960. For quite a number of years, the Department of Animal Husbandry has been conducting research on beef cattle on the San Joaquin Experimental Range owned and operated by the USDA Forest Service.

By the mid-1950s it had become clear that the U.S. Forest Service, owing to its own growing needs, would not be able to accommodate the University much longer. Hence, we had to seek another location and, after considerable investigation of alternative sites, one in Yuba County in the low foothills of the Sierra mountains was chosen.

Fair and Exposition Funds

Chall: Do I understand that horse racing money also came into agriculture?

Wellman: Yes. At the time that betting on horse racing was legalized in California (1933), the state's take from pari-mutuel betting was divided on a formula basis among the University of California, California Polytechnic College, and county and regional fairs, and the State Fair. These betting receipts were euphoniously called Fair and Exposition Funds. They were, according to the proponents of legalized betting on horse racing, to be used to promote agriculture on the grounds, I suppose, that horses were an agriculture product.

At first, the University's receipts of Fair and Exposition Funds were small but, over the years, they became large, amounting to over four million dollars a year by 1959-60. They had become so large, in fact, that the state legislature decided that the University and Cal Poly should no longer benefit directly from them but, rather, that the University's and Cal Poly's shares should go into the state's general fund.
Wellman: The University and, I presume, also Cal Poly were assured by the legislative leadership that the loss of Fair and Exposition Funds would be replaced by appropriations from the general fund. That assurance, as I recall, was honored for one or two years. Incidentally, county and regional fairs continued to receive a specific share of the betting proceeds. The counties, apparently, were able to marshall more votes in the legislature than the University or Cal Poly and thereby were able to protect their vested interests in the Fair and Exposition Funds.

Chall: What specifically were the funds used for?

Wellman: They were used for capital outlays for agriculture—for buildings, land acquisition, etc. That was the decision of the Regents. At Cal Poly, I understand, they were used mainly for current operations.

I must admit that, as vice-president—agricultural sciences, I found it highly advantageous to have a sizable fund that could be used for agricultural projects without having to seek state appropriations but which, of course, required approval of the president and the Regents. These agricultural projects, although included in the University's building program, were considered separately and, hence, did not have to wait on specific appropriations by the legislature.

Most of the structures on the Davis campus and quite a few of those on the Riverside campus that were built before 1960-61 were funded from Fair and Exposition Funds. We didn't try to define too strictly what was for agriculture. For example, on the Riverside campus, Fair and Exposition Funds were used to purchase Canyon Crest—a wartime housing development adjacent to the campus—to accommodate 275 married student families.

Building Up the Davis Campus

Chall: Before going on to other items, would you comment on the appointment of Stanley B. Freeborn as provost of the Davis campus and the transfer of Knowles A. Ryerson from Davis to Berkeley.
Wellman: I became involved in that shortly after my appointment as vice-president--agricultural sciences was announced and before I had taken office.

At the time he offered me the appointment, President Sproul stated that he would be pleased to have Stanley Freeborn as provost of the Davis campus. I met with the members of the Davis campus Budget Committee who, at that time, were among the most influential members of the Davis faculty and reported to them President Sproul's statement concerning Freeborn. They were quite enthusiastic. In the course of our discussion, they told me that, in their opinion, Knowles Ryerson would not be high on a list of potential candidates.

Chall: By all faculty leaders or just the members of the Budget Committee?

Wellman: The impression I got from the discussion was that opposition to Ryerson as provost was quite widespread. In addition to the five members of the Budget Committee, I appointed four other faculty members to the committee to advise on the selection of a provost. It reported unanimously in favor of the appointment of Freeborn.

As I learned more about the situation, I came to the conclusion that Ryerson had not had, as assistant dean of the College of Agriculture on the Davis campus, opportunity to demonstrate whatever administrative ability he had. Dean Hutchison had dealt directly with the chairmen of the departments and had delegated almost no authority to Ryerson with the exception of student affairs.

It was clear to me that, if Ryerson was not to be appointed provost, he should not remain at Davis. But, I also felt that he had served the University well under the circumstances and, consequently, should be offered a responsible position elsewhere. The solution I came up with was to recommend his appointment as dean of the College of Agriculture on the Berkeley campus--the position that Freeborn would have had if he had not been appointed provost of the Davis campus.

Ryerson, I know, was deeply disappointed in not being appointed provost of the Davis campus. He accepted the offer to transfer to Berkeley, and he carried out his duties there as dean of the College of Agriculture and assistant director of the Agricultural Experiment Station to my satisfaction and, I believe also, to the satisfaction of Chancellor Kerr. I came to have a high regard for him.
Chall: I came across a reference some place that you wanted to establish an agricultural biochemistry department at Davis and to transfer Eric Conn and Paul Stumpf to Davis.

Wellman: That is right. I discussed with the members of the faculty of the Department of Agricultural Biochemistry (originally Plant Biochemistry) at Berkeley the desirability of establishing a department at Davis. I was thinking of a joint Berkeley-Davis department similar to other joint departments on the two campuses. After a good deal of discussion, not only with the faculty of agricultural biochemistry at Berkeley but also with the chairman of the Berkeley Department of Biochemistry in the College of Letters and Science and the director of the Virus Laboratory, the decision was made to establish a separate Department of Agricultural Biochemistry with the Berkeley group in biochemistry but retaining their Agricultural Experiment Station status.

The establishment of a Department of Agricultural Biochemistry had, of course, the full support of Provost Freeborn and Dean Briggs.

Chall: Were other agricultural departments started at Davis during your term as vice-president—agricultural sciences?

Wellman: Yes, a Department of Nematology. It was established as a University-wide department with staff located on the Berkeley, Davis, and Riverside campuses. The major emphasis was on research.

The establishment of a separate Department of Nematology was initiated, as far as I know, by a farmer from southern California by the name of James Armstrong. I have forgotten what crop or crops he raised, but I remember well his insistence that the University should do much more research on the control of nematodes than it was doing and that a separate research group that would concentrate its full time and effort on such control should be established.

He obtained the support of influential agricultural groups and of influential state legislators, and he got introduced and passed a substantial addition to the University's budget earmarked for nematology research (around $60,000 in 1954-55, growing to $150,000 in 1958-59). He was a most effective lobbyist. The University accepted the special appropriation and started a separate Department of Nematology. At the time, I had
Wellman: some doubts about the advisability of a separate department as against adding to the existing departments of entomology; but, as far as I know, it has worked out well.

Chall: I believe that you were responsible for the transfer of Daniel G. Aldrich, Jr., from Riverside to Davis, that he succeeded you as head of the Division of Agricultural Sciences, and that later he was appointed chancellor of the Irvine campus.

Wellman: You are right on all three counts.

At my first conference with the faculty of the Citrus Experiment Station, after becoming vice-president--agricultural sciences, I was impressed with the comments of a young man named Daniel G. Aldrich, Jr., who was in the Department of Soils and Plant Nutrition. On inquiry I found that he was very highly regarded by both Homer D. Chapman, chairman of the department, and Alfred M. Boyce, director of the station.

Sometime later, in discussing the needs of the Davis campus with Provost Freeborn and Dean Briggs, I became convinced that the Davis unit of the Berkeley-Davis Department of Soils was urgently in need of strengthening; and in talking the matter over with the chairman of the department, who was located at Berkeley, I found that he had little interest in Davis. It seemed to me that a strong unit in soils was essential on the campus where production agriculture was located.

To materially strengthen the soils work on the Davis campus, I persuaded Aldrich to accept the chairmanship of the Berkeley-Davis department and make his headquarters at Davis. I also recommended that the newly established Kearney Foundation of Soil Science be housed on the Davis campus, and I concurred in having a building for soil science, originally scheduled to be built on the Berkeley campus, to be built instead on the Davis campus. Regent Gus Olsen, a farmer in the Clarksburg area, was the prime mover in getting that building for the Davis campus. I was a bit doubtful at first but soon became convinced.

In 1951-52 only two courses in soil science of one semester each were offered on the Davis campus. Six years later a full undergraduate major and substantial work at the graduate level were being given.
Chall: You mentioned the Kearney Foundation of Soil Science. Was it funded from the sale of the Kearney Ranch near Fresno?

Wellman: Yes. When the Kearney Ranch was sold, Dean Hutchison recommended and President Sproul and the Regents approved that the funds received from the sale--around $1,700,000--be placed in a permanent endowment to support basic research in arid soils. Since Dean Hutchison had retired before the precise organization of the Kearney Foundation had been decided upon, I had to make that determination; or, rather, I made the recommendation to President Sproul, and it was approved by him and the Regents.

Three alternative types of organization were considered: (1) the Giannini Foundation type where the foundation income was used to supplement the research activities of the related department, (2) the Water Resources Center type where most of the income was used for research grants to faculty members in different departments working on some aspect of water resources, and (3) the Scripps Institution of Oceanography type with a full-time staff of its own.

After considerable discussion within the Division of Agricultural Sciences, the third alternative was adopted. It had been recommended strongly by Professor Emeritus Walter Kelley, probably the most eminent soil scientist ever employed by the University. I think it was a good decision at the time, but the Giannini Foundation type or the water resources type may have become more appropriate in recent years. Conditions change, and organizational patterns should be adapted to the changed conditions.

In case you get the idea that I was biased in favor of the Davis campus, which I do not think I was, I would like to mention that I persuaded the chairman of the Department of Vegetable Crops, James E. Knott, to form a joint Davis-Riverside department and locate some of its staff at Riverside. I also urged the Department of Agronomy at Davis to locate a few of its staff at Riverside. That took more time to accomplish and it only happened after I had left the division.

While I am talking about shifts of activities from one campus to another, I should not overlook the effort that Chancellor Kerr and I made to move a part of Department of Home Economics at Berkeley to Davis.
Wellman: After looking into the matter, it seemed to us that complete offerings of traditional home economics on both the Berkeley and Davis campus involved needless duplication and that a comprehensive department should be developed on one campus but not on both. The Davis campus wanted to have a full development in home economics. Chancellor Kerr, on the other hand, felt that a department restricted to instruction and research in human nutrition would fully meet the needs of the Berkeley campus. It was in nutrition that the Berkeley Department of Home Economics, under the chairmanship of Agnes Fay Morgan, had made its greatest strides. She was a distinguished scientist in her own right and had built around her a distinguished group in nutrition.

Chancellor Kerr and I had expected that the proposal to move home economics, other than nutrition, from Berkeley to Davis would encounter some opposition, but we had not anticipated the extent of that opposition. Objections came from far and wide, or so it seemed--from the California Home Economics Association, from the National Home Economics Association, from the deans of home economics of the Association of Land Grant Colleges and Universities, from the Prytanean Society on the Berkeley campus, and probably from others. At one meeting attended by some forty women to protest the transfer, one irate lady said, "Chancellor Kerr, I want you to know that women live longer than men and there are more of us."

Despite the protests against it, the move was eventually made with some savings of resources and without detriment to students. Nutrition remained strong on the Berkeley campus, and a full complement of courses in all phases of home economics was developed at Davis.

Statewide Committee on Buildings and Campus Development

Chall: You were on the statewide building committee, weren't you?

Wellman: Yes. I was appointed to that committee by President Sproul along about 1953, and I served as chairman of the committee for several years. Its official name was the "Statewide Coordinating Committee on Buildings and Campus Development."
What did the committee do?

Its main job was to prepare a University-wide building program for presentation to the president, the Regents, and state officials.

The committee started with the requests as submitted by the campuses, arranged the projects according to uses, and placed them in a University-wide priority order. We paid careful attention to both the priorities and size of projects in the campus submittals but did not always follow them.

We tended to put facilities that would accommodate students at the top of the list. Some projects, as submitted, were larger than was justified by the evidence available to us, and we reduced their size. Occasionally, we increased the size of a project and, in a few instances, we added one. Any substantial change in a campus program was discussed with the campus people before a final decision was made, usually on a staff level.

The campus requests included far more projects than could be accommodated in a single year. The committee went as far as it thought there was a reasonable possibility of getting that amount of funds and then simply listed the remainder of the campus requests without attempting to place them in a University-wide priority order.

Later, the State Department of Finance required that each agency submit moving five-year capital outlay programs; and, still later, it required that funds requested for proposed building be broken down into preliminary plans, working drawings, construction, and equipment. On large structures the time schedule was usually one year for preparation of preliminary plans, one year for preparation of working drawings, two years for construction, and one year for purchase and installation of equipment. On smaller structures the time from beginning to end could usually be compressed but seldom, if ever, less than two full years.

One thing that should be stressed was the excellent work that was done by the staff of the University-wide Office of Architects and Engineers in preparing the voluminous material for the committee's consideration and in advising the committee. Robert Evans, Roscoe Weaver, Donovan Smith, and Robert Walen deserve special mention.
Wellman: Donovan Smith had developed space standards by disciplines for classrooms and laboratories, and these proved indispensable for relating building needs to prospective student enrollments.

Chall: Who were the other members of the committee?

Wellman: The membership shifted somewhat from year to year, and I do not recall all of the changes. Baldwin Woods, vice-president--university extension, was chairman of the committee the first year I was on it. Richard Stull, vice-president--medical and health sciences, succeeded me as chairman in 1957-58. There were always two faculty representatives on the committee--one from the Northern Section of the Academic Senate and one from the Southern Section.

The other day I looked up the minutes of a meeting of the Regents' Committee on Grounds and Buildings at which the University's building program was being considered. That meeting was held in Santa Barbara in September, 1955. I remember it well.

The members of the committee at that time, in addition to myself, were E.T. Grether, Academic Senate, Northern Division; Martin R. Huberty, Academic Senate, Southern Division; Richard J. Stull, vice-president--medical and health sciences; Gordon S. Watkins, provost of the Riverside campus; and J. Harold Williams, provost of the Santa Barbara campus.

Chall: What was so special about the September, 1955, meeting of the Regents' Committee on Grounds and Buildings?

Wellman: It may not have been special to anyone else, but it was to me. I'll have to go back to the August meeting on that committee at which I presented, on behalf of President Sproul, the proposed University-wide building program for 1956-57. Quite a few questions were asked, most of which I could answer and some of which I could not. Several of the Regents from southern California felt that the proposed program for UCLA was too small relative to the proposed program for Berkeley. Chancellor Allen also held that view. Those Regents requested that the matter be given further consideration by the administration, that additional information be provided, and that the program be brought back the following month.
Wellman: I had frequently sought advice on matters of procedure before the Regents from Robert M. Underhill, long-time secretary and treasurer of the Regents, who seemed to know just what to do in difficult situations. After the August meeting, I asked him for suggestions on what to do at the September meeting. He told me that on one occasion he had presented a matter which the Regents had deferred on the grounds that they needed more information. At the next meeting of the committee, he brought along the entire record on the matter which filled several filing cases—he had had them delivered by truck. That gave me the idea which I followed at the September, 1955, meeting of the Regents' Committee on Grounds and Buildings.

The day before, at my request, Robert V. Walen and Ian E. Turner of the Office of Architects and Engineers loaded all of the material that the coordinating committee had used in reaching its decisions on the building program on a truck, took them to Santa Barbara, and placed them in the room in which the Regents' committee would be meeting the following morning. The walls of that room—and it was a fairly large room—were nearly covered with charts. All of the members of the coordinating committee attended that Regents' meeting. I made about a two-hour presentation explaining, in detail, the procedures that we had followed and the basis for the decisions that we had reached. It was well received, and the program was approved unanimously.

I learned one thing from that experience; namely, in making presentations to the Regents, it is much better to be overprepared than underprepared.

Early Consideration of Campus Size and Development

Chall: In basing the building programs on the projected student enrollments, were you also reaching a decision on how large each campus was supposed to grow?

Wellman: Well, no. The Statewide Coordinating Committee on Buildings and Campus Development didn't make decisions on sizes of campuses. Those were made by the Regents.

There was discussion of size of campuses at the August, 1957, meeting of the Regents' Committee on Educational Policy.
Wellman: held in the University extension facilities at Lake Arrowhead. President Sproul was at home ill, and I acted in his behalf.

Chancellor Kerr presented an academic plan for the Berkeley campus. He did a superb job. I suspect that it was at that meeting that a number of Regents began to think seriously of him as an excellent replacement for President Sproul.

The Berkeley campus academic plan proposed a limitation on enrollment of 25,000 students; and in President Sproul's report, which I presented, that size was proposed as the maximum size for any campus. The Regents were hesitant at that time about setting an upper limit on student enrollments but did agree that plans for the Berkeley and Los Angeles campuses, excluding the UCLA Medical Center, could be based upon student enrollments of 25,000. Later that figure was raised to 27,500.

At that same meeting of the Regents' Committee on Educational Policy, I presented, on behalf of President Sproul, the report of a Special Planning Committee on Policies and Programs for the Development of the La Jolla campus of which I was the chairman.

The year before the Regents had approved the establishment of a graduate teaching and research program in science and technology at La Jolla and had, I believe, accepted about sixty acres of land from the city of San Diego for that purpose. That sixty acres joined the Scripps Institution of Oceanography campus on the north. The idea of a graduate and research program in science and technology originated with Roger R. Revelle, at that time director of the Scripps Institution of Oceanography. He pushed the idea vigorously, and he was successful in getting the president and the Regents to approve it and in getting the city of San Diego to donate the land. However, a number of prominent citizens of San Diego, several of whom were alumni of the Berkeley campus, felt that a general campus in the San Diego area was fully justified. It was, I suspect, in response to their urging that President Sproul appointed the special planning committee.

The special planning committee recommended and the Regents approved (1) the establishment of a general campus in the San Diego-La Jolla area and (2) the expansion of faculty and facilities of the La Jolla campus to provide a graduate program in science and technology together with the necessary undergraduate instruction to support that program.
Wellman: Revelle was a member of the special planning committee and at his urging the committee adopted two other recommendations which were not, however, recommended by the president nor considered by the Regents at that time. They were (1) that a provost of the La Jolla campus be appointed promptly and (2) that he be given considerable authority.

Establishing the Water Resources Center

Chall: I would like to talk to you now about your work in the establishment of the statewide Water Resources Center. That was in October, 1957. You were appointed to the first Coordinating Board, and I was wondering whether you had been at work on it prior to the time that it was established.

Wellman: In May of 1956, I was appointed chairman of a special University-wide Committee on Research in Water Resources by President Sproul. The other members of that committee were L.M.K. Boelter, dean, College of Engineering, Los Angeles campus; M.P. O'Brien, dean, College of Engineering, Berkeley campus; E.D. Howe, chairman, Division of Mechanical Engineering, Berkeley campus, and R.R. Revelle, director, Scripps Institution of Oceanography, San Diego.

The state legislature had just appropriated $100,000 to the University for research in water resources, and the sponsors of the legislation headed by Senator Randolph Collier had indicated that the University would likely be called upon in the future for expanded research in the field.

The special committee was charged with (1) advising the president on the best immediate use of the funds ($100,000) appropriated for 1956-57, (2) preparing an inventory of the research on water resources that was being done throughout the University, (3) preparing a prospectus of University research that might contribute to fundamental knowledge in the field, and (4) suggesting the form of organization that should be adopted for carrying out an expanded program of research in water resources.

During 1956-57, an inventory of recent and current research on water resources by the University was prepared and published in mimeograph form, a series of conferences was held throughout
Wellman: the state on important aspects of water resources, a start was made on a unified collection of library materials on water resources, and a proposal for a University-wide Water Resources Center was formulated and sent to President Sproul.

The special committee recommended that the Water Resources Center, instead of having a permanent research staff of its own, operate mainly through the allocation of funds under its control of existing departments and other units of the University for research by members of those units on approved projects. A Coordinating Board was established to advise on the allocation of research funds, and provision was made for a part-time director and necessary secretarial assistance. Martin R. Huberty, professor of Soils and Irrigation at UCLA, was appointed director. I was assigned general administrative supervision of the center, and I was also appointed chairman of the Coordinating Board.

An Advisory Council was appointed made up of persons from the several areas of the state having an interest in and a knowledge of the state's many water problems.

Chall: Why was general administrative supervision assigned to you?

Wellman: Well, I assume that President Sproul didn't want the director of the center to report directly to his office. But since the center was a University-wide activity, its director should report to a University-wide officer. It was more logical to have him report to the vice-president--agricultural sciences than to any of the other vice-presidents. Agriculture, along with engineering, would be heavily involved in the work of the center, and there was no University-wide officer for engineering.

Chall: Why was there not, do you think?

Wellman: Mainly, I suppose, because there was not a real need for one. Unlike the situation in agriculture there were no large organized research and extension programs in engineering financed with state and federal funds and with permanent employees. Research and extension in engineering were mainly matters of individual faculty members' choices. They were employed on a nine-months basis and were free to do research when they wanted to and on what they wanted to without regard to the needs of the state, and also they were free to do consulting work for outside firms for pay and most of them did.
Wellman: They also received extra pay for any extension teaching they did.

Deans Boelter and O'Brien advocated the appointment of a vice-president for engineering, and President Sproul talked to me one time about expanding my title to vice-president--agriculture and engineering. But I could not see the justification for it and I doubt that he could either. At least, he did not bring the matter up with me again.

Deans Boelter and O'Brien should, I think, be given the credit for originating the idea of a Water Resources Center in the University and, I suspect, that they suggested to Senator Collier the need for substantial state support for University research in water resources. Senator Collier was deeply involved in the state's highway system and, I am told, had become acquainted with Boelter and O'Brien in connection with the work of the University's Institute of Transportation and Traffic Engineering.

Term on the State Board of Agriculture, 1953-1958

Chall: You were appointed to the State Board of Agriculture some time in October, 1953; by whom, Governor Warren or Knight?

Wellman: By both; by Governor Warren to fill out Dean Hutchison's term and then by Governor Knight.

Chall: Why were you appointed?

Wellman: I believe that the statute creating the State Board of Agriculture provides that the head of agriculture in the University of California should be a member.

Chall: How do you feel about that?

Wellman: I think it provides a good link between the University's research and extension activities in agriculture and the State Department of Agriculture's regulatory activities. It made it easier to iron out any jurisdictional conflicts which might arise. I do not recall any serious ones arising while I was on the board.

Chall: What were your specific duties on the board?
Wellman: I had no specific duties as such. There were no committees of the board. It always met as a committee of the whole. Our duties were to advise the governor of the state and the director of the State Department of Agriculture on the agricultural policies it thought the state should pursue and on the general operations of the State Department of Agriculture. The board was an advisory board, not an administrative board. The director of the department always met with the board, and usually one or two of the division heads reported on their current activities.

Chall: Was membership on the State Board of Agriculture of help to you as vice-president--agricultural sciences?

Wellman: Yes, I think it was, although I cannot cite specific instances. It was more a general help. The members of the board, other than I, were influential farmers from different areas of the state. Being acquainted with them personally was advantageous. One thing that helps rather than hinders the University is for its administrators to have a wide acquaintance with influential people throughout the state. President Sproul was an ideal example.

Chall: Did the presence of the president of the State Board of Agriculture on the Board of Regents give a tremendous amount of additional power to agricultural people? How did you feel about that as you watched it from inside the Regents?

Wellman: It was an advantage to the Division of Agricultural Sciences, but not, I think, at the expense of other parts of the University. Rather, having a good relationship between the agricultural interests of the state and the University helped the entire University. At the time I became vice-president--agricultural sciences, state senators from rural counties still had a powerful influence.

To my mind A.J. McFadden was an excellent Regent, not only from the standpoint of agriculture but also from the standpoint of the entire University. I never heard him even suggest that the budget for any other part of the University should be reduced in order to provide more money for agriculture. He was certainly held in high respect by the other Regents.

Chall: Do you know whether the University is still represented on the State Board of Agriculture?
Wellman: Yes. Daniel G. Aldrich, Jr., as University Dean of Agriculture, followed me; and he was followed by Maurice L. Peterson who became University Dean of Agriculture when Aldrich was appointed chancellor of the Irvine campus. James B. Kendrick, Jr., who succeeded Peterson with a change in title back to vice-president--agricultural sciences, is currently a member of the State Board of Agriculture.

Appointment

Chall: We can go on now to your appointment as vice-president of the University. Of course, first Dr. Kerr was appointed president.

Wellman: Clark Kerr was selected as successor to Sproul at the October, 1957, meeting of the Regents held on the Davis campus.

I had left the Regents' meeting as soon as the Regents went into a "Regents Only Session" as Ruth and I had a dinner engagement with Earl Coke and his wife, Billie, in San Francisco that evening. At that time, Coke was vice-president of the Bank of America in charge of its agricultural operations. He had replaced Jesse Tapp who had been appointed chairman of the board of the bank with headquarters in Los Angeles.

Coke had resigned his position as director of the Agricultural Extension Service, University of California. Prior to his resignation, he had served two years as assistant secretary of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. On our way home from Davis, I heard on the car radio that Clark Kerr had been appointed president to be effective July 1, 1958. I was delighted. I've already mentioned the very high regard I had for him.

On Sunday afternoon following his appointment as president, Clark and his wife Kay stopped by our house and he offered me the position of vice-president of the University. He said that he had mentioned to the Regents that he wanted me for his executive vice-president and that they had given their informal approval. Kerr also said that he would not ask the Regents to
Wellman: take formal action on my appointment until after he had taken office. That was okay with me.

That position had been created by the Regents six years before but had never been filled. In lieu of an executive vice-president, Sproul had, with the Regents' approval, appointed Stanley McCaffrey as vice-president-executive assistant.

After thinking the matter over for a few days, I accepted Kerr's offer. As I have said, I had high admiration for him, and I felt that I could work well under him. Also, I thought the job would be an interesting one. It was. Then, also, I knew that if, after a trial period, I did not like the arrangement, I could return to teaching and research. At that time I had not been away from my field so long that I could not catch up with a six months' or a year's study on sabbatical leave.

Chall: So, he did not let much time go by before he began to appoint his administration.

Wellman: I don't know how much more he did right away. Later on, he discussed with me several persons who might replace him as chancellor at Berkeley. He chose Glen T. Seaborg after receiving a report from a special faculty committee.

Seaborg was appointed chancellor at Berkeley, and I was appointed vice-president of the University at the July, 1958, meeting of the Regents.

The rumor that I would be appointed vice-president of the University broke in the newspapers about two weeks before the July meeting of the Regents. Just who leaked it, I have never been told. I was a bit embarrassed. Several newspaper reporters telephoned me. All I could say was "No comment."

Chall: How long did it take for you to go from vice-president--agricultural sciences to your new job?

Wellman: Actually, I held both jobs for five-and-a-half months until Daniel G. Aldrich, Jr., was appointed University Dean of Agriculture-effective January 1, 1959. Kerr felt that the title for the statewide officers in charge of agriculture and University Extension should be University dean rather than vice-president. During those five-and-a-half months, I spent much more time on overall University matters than on agriculture.
Working with President Clark Kerr

Chall: What were the differences you found in the methods of administration as between President Sproul and President Kerr? You worked with both of them very closely.

Wellman: Yes, I did, but on quite different assignments. I had a much better opportunity for observing how Kerr worked than how Sproul worked. I saw Kerr frequently; I saw Sproul infrequently.

As the person in charge of only one of the activities of the University (although a major one), I did not need to see the president very often. As the executive vice-president for the entire University, I needed to see the president or talk with him on the telephone frequently—several times a week—especially during the first year. Also, when I was vice-president—agricultural sciences, my office was in Giannini Hall across the campus from Sproul's office in the Administration Building. When I was vice-president of the University, my office was close to Kerr's.

Chall: I understand that President Sproul was very careful about the scheduling of appointments, and these were screened quite carefully. Did this change at all?

Wellman: No, I don't think so. No president of a big university can possibly see everybody who wants to see him and be an effective president. He has to conserve his time. Kerr set aside one or two days a week for appointments in his office. They were usually scheduled from nine o'clock in the morning through the noon hour with sandwiches at his desk (a round table) until seven or eight o'clock in the evening. On the nonappointment days, when he was in town, he worked at home. He had a great capacity for work and he turned out an enormous amount of it. Long hours, uninterrupted time, concentration, and, of course, outstanding ability all contributed to his remarkable productivity.

One of the things that I greatly appreciated and which I think was much appreciated by all of the vice-presidents and chancellors was his promptness in replying to requests—in making decisions. Nearly every afternoon around five o'clock, when he was in town, his administrative assistant, Gloria Copeland, would deliver to his home the material that had come in that day which required his attention. On her way to the office the next morning, she would go by Kerr's home and pick up the material
Wellman: he had gone over. A lot of the material sent to him one day would come back the next with his comments and decisions. Some would come back the day following. As far as I remember, none was held up for more than three or four days.

It was quite different under President Sproul. On more than one occasion, material which I had sent him lay in his office unanswered for several weeks.

When the need arose, I could always get Kerr on the telephone. Even when he was out of town—in Southern California, in the East, or in Europe—he would return a telephone call from me as promptly as he could. Naturally, I did not telephone him when he was out of the state unless it was really urgent and could not wait until he returned. In fact, I never telephoned him on any matter which I felt I could handle. And, as time went on and I learned what he would want done in specific situations, I did not have to consult with him as frequently.

I did try to keep him informed on the situations on the several campuses and in statewide as I encountered them—either in personal conversation, by telephone, or by memorandum.

Chall: I would like to know how you rank Clark Kerr as president of the University of California.

Wellman: At the dinner the chancellors gave for Clark Kerr shortly after his dismissal, I said that, in my judgment, he was one of the three greatest presidents that the University had had in its 100-year history. I still think so. The other two were Benjamin Ide Wheeler and Robert Gordon Sproul. I never knew Benjamin Ide Wheeler so my judgment of him is based entirely upon what I have read about him and what I have heard from older faculty members who knew him. I did know Robert Gordon Sproul. I met him and heard him speak before he became president of the University. I became well acquainted with him during the years I served under him as vice-president—agricultural sciences. I feel that I knew Clark Kerr even better than I knew Bob Sproul.
Chall: I know that you were active in most, if not all, areas of University-wide administration. Were there some areas for which you had greater responsibility than others?

Wellman: Yes, I spent more time on budgeting and academic personnel than on any of the other areas. Budgeting was in two parts—current operations and capital outlay.

Revising the Annual Operating Budget

Chall: Let's talk about budgeting for current operations first—some of the history of it and its decentralization.

Wellman: My participation in reform of the University's operating budget goes back to 1951-52 while I was still director-chairman of the Giannini Foundation and Department of Agricultural Economics.

In late 1951 or early 1952, President Sproul appointed a special committee to consider improvements in the form of the annual operating budget of the University and in the procedures for its preparation and presentation to the Regents. The members of that committee were: James H. Corley, vice-president—business affairs; Ellis J. Groff, University budget officer; Joseph P. Harris, professor of political science, Berkeley campus; Olaf Lundberg, University controller; and William K. Schmelzle, professor of business administration, Berkeley campus. I served as chairman.

The special committee submitted its report to President Sproul in the spring of 1952 (dated March 12, 1952). It called for drastic changes in the format of the University's budget for current operations. Our recommendations, after being reviewed and endorsed by the Academic Senate Committees on Budget and Interdepartmental Relations and by Chancellors Allen and Kerr, were approved by President Sproul virtually unchanged and, on his recommendation, were approved by a Regents' Sub-committee on Budget Procedure in early 1953 and later were adopted by the full board.
Wellman: You may want to include our committee's report in the appendix. It turned out to be a rather important document.

Chall: Good, I'll take that.

Wellman: Up to that time, and I presume back to its first budget, the University had prepared two budget documents each year (or biennium) identical in form; namely, the State Budget Request and the Annual Budget. Each document consisted of detailed departmental allocations by object of expenditure, together with the names, titles, and salaries of the individual employees both academic and nonacademic. Summary tables were few in number, and analytical tables and explanations were entirely missing. The figures in the Annual Budget departed from those in the State Budget Request, owing to the difference in the amount of money approved by the legislature and the governor and that requested by the Regents. Using an analogy, the State Budget Request consisted of a description of each tree in a large and complex forest and of each limb on each tree. But it did not provide information on the important characteristics of the forest itself or of the significant steps being proposed for its development. Attention was directed toward minutia. The Regents could not possibly tell whether the many minute changes being proposed by the president were necessary or desirable. If they had confidence in the president, they approved the budget request pro forma; if they did not—and toward the end of Sproul's term some of them did not—they resorted to nit-picking more to embarrass Sproul, I fear, than to make improvements.

The enormous amount of detail in the State Budget Request encouraged the staff of the State Department of Finance to concentrate their attention on minutia. In fact, they had no alternative if they wanted to make any reduction in the University's request. And it was, of course, part of their job to keep the University from being extravagant. They tried to perform that job by questioning many small expenditures, i.e., the need for another teaching assistant in one department, the need for a clerk in another, the need for a new typewriter in a third, and so on.

Our committee recommended that the University's State Budget Request consist of extensive summary and analytical tables, together with a president's budget message explaining the principal features of the budget, significant trends and
Wellman: developments, substantial extension or curtailment activities, proposed new activities, and so on.

Our committee also recommended that the University's Annual Budget be limited to departmental allocations, numbers and aggregate salaries of academic and nonacademic employees, general assistance, supplies and expense, equipment and facilities, and special items. Names, titles, and salaries of individual employees were to be excluded from the Annual Budget and, in lieu thereof, shown in an annual Personnel Roster.

The changeover from the old to the new format was started with the 1953-54 budget, but it was not fully completed until after Kerr became president and Loren Furtado became budget director. It took time to wean the staff of the State Department of Finance from concentrating on minutia. Also, it is fair, I think, to say that it took time to convince the University's own budget staff that the new procedures were better than the old.

Then, too, the new procedures required the development of workload measures of various kinds such as average student-faculty ratios, average departmental support per faculty member, average cost of plant maintenance per unit of space, and average costs of other business operations per appropriate units. The workload measures had not only to be acceptable to us but also had to be acceptable to the State Department of Finance and the legislative analyst.

Developing Workload Measures for Teaching

Wellman: The workload measures that I had most to do with were in the academic area.

The development of an acceptable student-faculty ratio took quite a bit of time. I refrain from saying a satisfactory student-faculty ratio. None of us was satisfied with the one we used, and we kept trying to improve it but without much success. The one that was adopted for the general campuses was a weighted ratio with weights of 1 for lower division students; 1.5 for upper division students; 2.5 for professional, master's, and first-stage doctoral students; and 3.5 for second-stage doctoral students. One year, about 1965, Sidney Hoos,
Wellman: professor of agricultural economics on the Berkeley campus, spent a good deal of time in the president's office experimenting with different weights. He concluded that the set of weights then being used was about as valid as any other plausible set.

Chall: I'm not sure that I fully understand the reason for using a weighted student-faculty ratio rather than an unweighted one. Would you explain a bit?

Wellman: The basic idea of a weighted ratio is to reflect the relative differences in faculty time required for teaching students at the various levels. Everybody seemed to agree that more faculty time is required to teach a hundred graduate students than to teach a hundred undergraduate students. The disagreements related to just how much more time.

Another workload measure that was adopted was an average cost per faculty member for support items in departments of instruction and research, that is, for nonacademic salaries, general assistance, supplies and expenses, and equipment and facilities.

The use of a weighted student-faculty ratio, coupled with the use for a time of a formula of an increase in one FTE teaching assistant for each increase of four FTE faculty members, led to some undesirable results which we had not anticipated at the time they were adopted. The standards for admission tended to be lowered, and retention of graduate students increased, and more of the lower division instruction tended to be done by teaching assistants. These consequences were not, of course, uniform among the campuses or among the departments on the same campus; but they became wide enough spread to require corrective action.

Chall: What is an FTE?

Wellman: The initials FTE stand for full-time equivalent. Most teaching assistants and some faculty members are employed part-time. For some purposes (budgeting, staffing formulas, etc.), part-time positions are converted to full-time equivalent positions.

Chall: I'm not clear why the weighted student-faculty ratio and the one teaching assistant to four faculty members would cause difficulty.
Perhaps I can explain it this way. Under the weighted student-faculty ratio, the larger the proportionate increase in graduate students, the larger the increase in faculty positions. And under the 1:4 ratio of teaching assistants to faculty members, the larger the number of faculty positions, the larger the number of teaching assistant positions. And the larger the number of teaching assistant positions, the larger the number of graduate students that could be supported financially, and also the larger the number of teaching assistants available for teaching a given number of lower division students.

Two steps were taken to avoid the undesirable consequences. First, the number of teaching assistants was related to the number of lower division students rather than to the number of faculty members which, in turn, under the weighted student-faculty ratio was influenced more by a given increase in graduate students than in undergraduate students. Second, the number of years which a graduate student could be counted for budget purposes were limited.

In the case of libraries, there was never agreement within the University on how fast the several campus libraries should grow. The Berkeley campus, which already had an outstanding library, contended that it must continue to grow at the same rate as the increase in scholarly publications. UCLA contended that it should have as large a library as Berkeley; and since it did not, it had to grow more rapidly than Berkeley in order to catch up. The other campuses wanted libraries that would provide fully for the needs of doctoral students in all major disciplines and for all of the research needs of their faculties. The combined requests of the campuses were enormous, far beyond the funds that we could reasonably expect the state to provide.

Developing the Library Growth Plan

Around 1960, President Kerr asked the University-wide Library Council to try its hand at developing a ten-year library growth plan for the University. That never got off the ground. In 1961 President Kerr, himself, developed a ten-year plan which was approved by the Regents. It called for developing and maintaining two great research libraries, one in the north at Berkeley and the other in the south at UCLA. The other campuses
Wellman: would have smaller libraries with adequate instructional materials and frequently used research materials. This was accompanied by an intercampus exchange plan with daily bus service from the other northern campuses to Berkeley and from the other southern campuses to UCLA.

A striking feature of the 1961 library plan was that numbers were attached to the proposed growth in the size of collections. Collections at Berkeley would be increased 4 percent a year until the total reached 3 million volumes; thereafter, the annual addition would be 120,000 volumes. UCLA would grow to 3 million volumes by 1971 and thereafter would add 120,000 volumes a year. The collections on the other campuses by 1971 were to total 3 million volumes, with Davis, Riverside, and Santa Barbara having at least 500,000 volumes each, and the new campuses having a basic collection of at least 75,000 volumes when they opened. As was expected, there was quite a bit of griping over the figures by the campus librarians, stimulated in large part by faculty members. For some faculty members, no library, however large, was large enough.

The library growth plan provided a solid guide for budgeting. While never formally agreed to by the State Department of Finance and the legislative analyst, our annual budget request, based on it, was almost always accepted. Over the years, it saved many hours of discussion at the budget hearings--both the internal ones as well as the external ones.

While I cannot prove it, I feel that the University's library needs were more nearly met by having the plan than they would have been without it.

To oversee the plan and to encourage intercampus cooperation, President Kerr established an executive committee of the Library Council consisting of two faculty members, four campus librarians, and myself. I served as chairman.

In 1966 the 1971 goal of 3 million volumes for the campuses other than Berkeley and UCLA was raised to 4,100,000 volumes largely as a result of the decision that all campuses of the University (except San Francisco) would be planned as general campuses. That decision was influenced greatly by the more rapid increase in student enrollment than had been predicted by the University's 1960 growth plan and by the expectation that enrollment would continue upward at a rapid pace for years to come. The latter expectation did not materialize.
San Diego was accorded more favorable treatment than Irvine or Santa Cruz. At the inauguration of John S. Galbraith as chancellor of the San Diego campus, the principal speaker, Fred Harrington, president of the University of Wisconsin and also a historian, mentioned the need for a great library on the San Diego campus; and the clergyman who gave the invocation asked the blessing of God on that enterprise. I doubt that those appeals influenced our decision to provide larger annual increases in library collections for San Diego than for the other two new campuses. Rather, we were influenced by the larger graduate enrollment and by the longer time required to travel from San Diego to Los Angeles than from Irvine to Los Angeles or from Santa Cruz to Berkeley.

Developing Workload Measures for Organized Research

Turning now to organized research, we never did come up with a valid workload measure for it. One time, I recall, I tried out the idea on the State Department of Finance that funds for organized research should be related to changes in the total number of faculty members; that an increase of, say, 10 percent in the number of faculty members based on workload should be accompanied by an increase of 10 percent in state appropriations for organized research. The Department of Finance rejected that idea on the grounds that any increase in funds for an organized research unit should be justified on the basis of the need for expanding the program of that unit. Hence, all of our proposals for increased funds for organized research units—other than cost rises—were classified by the Department of Finance as improvements.

Your colleagues in University Hall have said quite sincerely some rather glowing things about your budgeting work. I think we might just put them into the record and see how you react to what they said. These are not direct quotes, of course. They said you had an uncanny approach to budgeting matters; that you had a remarkable sense of ascertaining what was really needed to carry out the University's program and a sense of what the University could justify to the legislature in order to get the funds; that, in general, you were as fine a budget man as (one individual) has ever seen or could imagine.
Wellman: Well, naturally I am pleased by their comments. But what was accomplished—and I think a good deal was accomplished in budgeting procedures and in the results achieved—was by a team effort on the campuses and in University Hall. Loren Furtado, University budget director, deserves a good deal of credit. He and his staff assembled the evidence on which the campus requests could be evaluated, and he encouraged the campus budget offices to provide solid evidence in support of the campus requests.

We never asked for more than we felt was justified, and we were able to justify with the State Department of Finance, the legislative analyst, the state legislature, and the governor most of what we asked for.

Relationships with the State Department of Finance, and Governors Brown and Reagan

Wellman: The person with whom I worked most closely in the State Department of Finance was Roy Bell, assistant director of the department. He was a top-flight professional—analytical, knowledgeable, fair, and tough.

Hale Champion was director of the State Department of Finance during most of Governor Brown's two terms. He turned out to be a very good director, much better than his background as a newspaper reporter would have indicated.

Kerr would usually discuss with Champion, at the beginnings of our hearings with the department, the broad aspects of the University budget requests and, on several occasions, he made a special trip to Sacramento to see Champion on some very important item which I had not been able to resolve with Roy Bell. Also, on two or three occasions, Kerr and members of the Regents' Committee on Finance went to Sacramento and met with Governor Brown on some matter on which Kerr and Champion could not agree. Champion was, of course, always present at the meetings. I was there, also.

Except for Governor Brown's first budget, we were always able to reach an agreement with him and his staff on his request to the state legislature for support of the University. That was a great advantage at the hearings before the Assembly Ways
Wellman: and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee. The State Department of Finance presented its requests for support of the University and defended them. Naturally, we gave every possible assistance not only at the hearing but also in calling on influential legislators.

The situation was much different after Ronald Reagan became governor. In 1967 and again in 1968, we had to oppose the governor's budget for the University before the legislative committees as being too low. We were successful in getting the legislature to add some funds to the governor's budget but not nearly as much as was needed. But the Governor cut the additions out when they reached his desk. I understand that that situation has not changed much since I retired.

Chall: What about Governor Brown's first budget?

Wellman: That was the budget for 1959-60 which he submitted in January, 1959. It called for a drastic reduction in University support. For example, all of the funds for University Extension were deleted. We had no indication of the drastic nature of the reductions until they were announced. We had not been consulted in advance. Brown had been elected the previous November, and possibly he and his first director of the State Department of Finance, Bert Levitt, did not have any time for consultations.

However, I have the suspicion that at the time Brown was more impressed with the state colleges than with the University. During his campaign, Brown had been invited to speak on all of the state college campuses, and he did. But he was not allowed to speak on any University of California campus. Under the Regents' rules, no person running for political office could. Both Henry Wallace, when he was running for president, representing the Progressive party, and Adlai Stevenson, when he was seeking the Democratic nomination for the presidency, had to speak in a street adjoining the Berkeley campus.

Soon after Kerr became president of the University, he began to explore very tentatively the possibility of the state colleges at Fresno, San Diego, San Francisco, and San Jose becoming campuses of the University. In terms of quality, they were superior to the other state colleges. At his request, I called on President Dumke of San Francisco State College and President Wahlquist of San Jose State College in order to obtain their views. They were noncommittal but did not close the door entirely. After
Wellman: Brown's election, they did. Apparently, they felt, from their conversations with candidate Brown, that, if he were elected, he would support their strong desire to give graduate instruction leading to the Ph.D. degree.

Following the Regents' meeting in December, 1958, President Kerr left for a trip around the world under the auspices of the Ford Foundation. He did not return in time for the January, 1959, meeting of the Regents which was Governor Brown's first meeting with them. That was my first experience as acting president at a Regents' meeting. It was not my last.

After Kerr returned we were able to obtain the approval of the State Department of Finance and the governor for restoration of some funds. Governor Brown gradually became a strong supporter of the University.

Chall: How did you get along with the legislative analyst?

Wellman: Very well, I think. I had high regard for Allen Post's professional competence and integrity, and I liked him personally. He called the shots as he saw them. He sometimes, it seemed to me, relied too heavily on the statements of inexperienced staff members. But he would withdraw his objections to a proposal if you could show him that those objections were based on inadequate evidence or faulty analysis.

Post would have been a great addition to the University's top administrative staff. I called on him one time at President Kerr's request to feel him out about becoming vice-president--government relations. That was after Corley had retired. He preferred to remain legislative analyst. In the course of our conversation, he made the statement that the University was bound to have more difficulty in getting adequate state support irrespective of the composition of the legislature or of the person who was elected governor simply because the state was undertaking extensive social welfare programs which, when fully funded, would require large increases in state appropriations. Thus, the University would face increased competition for state funds.
Decentralizing Administration of the Budget

Chall: What about decentralization of budgeting within the University? Wasn't there a good deal of it under Kerr?

Wellman: Yes, there was. A start had been made while Sproul was president—-from the Regents to the president but not beyond the president's office.

The 1952 Budget Reform Committee, of which I was chairman, went beyond the charge given to it by President Sproul. It made recommendations not only on the form of the annual operating budget and in the procedures for its preparation and presentation to the Regents but also on its administration. Among other things, the committee recommended that the president be given the authority to transfer funds between subdivisions of a departmental budget so long as the total was not exceeded. Up to that time, all such transfers had to be approved by the Regents' Committee on Finance (at that time called the Regents' Committee on Finance and Business Affairs) which met every week. Thus, the committee was asked to act on reams of minutiae about which they knew nothing and which they should not have taken any of their time to consider. Their approvals were, in fact, almost entirely pro forma.

Sproul did not, as far as I know, redelegate to the campuses any of the authority over intradepartmental transfers which the Regents had delegated to him. That was left for Kerr to do when he became president of the University.

Kerr not only delegated to the chancellors authority to approve intradepartmental transfers of funds but also inter-departmental transfers within specified control points. In order to do the latter, he first had to get the Regents to delegate that authority to him.

We learned by experience that delegation of authority to the campuses to approve amendments to the operating budget had to be accompanied by some restrictions.

Governor Brown, on recommendation of his Department of Finance, ruled in the spring of 1959 that the University would have to anticipate in its annual budget the amount of budgetary savings that it would achieve. Thus, from the total of authorized
Wellman: expenditures for the fiscal year was deducted a specified sum which the Governor's staff felt would normally be saved mainly from unfilled positions.

The University with, I suppose, the implicit approval of the state had wisely followed the policy of allowing departments (especially the academic departments) to retain unfilled positions. Thus, a department was able to conduct a careful search for the best-qualified person for the opening. It was not forced to take a less-qualified person for fear of losing the position. The result, when accumulated for all departments in the University, was a substantial amount of unexpended state funds allocated to salaries.

When the staff of the State Department of Finance first discovered that fact, I do not know. I do know that, in the early or mid-1950s, the savings of state funds actually achieved by the University one year were applied to reduce the state appropriation the second year following. A little later, the state demanded that the estimated savings in the current year had to be used to reduce the state appropriation for the following year. That estimate had to be made before the current year was over. Then, as I have said, the state required that savings for the budget year be anticipated before the year had begun—in fact, some six months before it was known how much savings would actually be realized in the current year.

Since almost all of the budgetary savings resulted from unfilled academic positions and since all of the academic positions were on campuses, the imposed budgetary savings had to be met by the appropriate campuses. Hence, we allocated to each campus the responsibility of coming up with its fair share of the aggregate budgetary savings required by the state.

The chancellors understood the situation and cooperated very well. In only one instance, as far as I can recall, did a campus fail to meet its savings allocation. Fortunately, other campuses more than met theirs so that the University, as a whole, did not run into the red. To discourage a repetition of deficit savings by a campus, the rule was imposed that "any expenditures made in excess of the approved budget and any disallowances of expenditures made by the state must be met by the chancellors from locally available non-state funds." That rule was apparently effective in preventing deficits in the campus budgetary savings allocations. At least none occurred after it was imposed.
Wellman: It might be useful to include in the appendix a copy of regulations dated August 12, 1965, granting chancellors authority to approve amendments to the campus operating budget. It shows how certain problems in the decentralization of operating budget administration were resolved.

Chall: A good idea.

Wellman: Another requirement that we found from experience had to be imposed on the campuses was that the number of FTE academic positions had to be retained intact and that, if a campus had X academic positions in one year and was allocated an additional twenty academic positions the next year, it had to have X + 20 fully funded academic positions at the end of that next year. Before this rule was established, one campus in particular tended to use all of the additional academic salary funds allocated to it on fewer than the number of additional academic positions it received. It hired more tenure faculty than was contemplated in its approved budget and was left with insufficient funds for the remaining nontenure positions.

Decentralizing Business Operations

Chall: It is my understanding that Kerr came into the presidency after having struggled with trying to run a campus as chancellor without authority and that he was committed to decentralization.

Wellman: That is right. Kerr was committed to decentralization and he moved promptly on it after he became president.

   His first job was to get the Regents to transfer the controller and the vice-president--business affairs who had been reporting directly to them to the president's jurisdiction. His next job was to transfer the employees in the controller and business-affairs areas who were physically located on the campuses from University-wide jurisdiction to campus jurisdiction. By 1962, that had been largely accomplished. Accounting, nonacademic personnel, purchasing, and architects and engineers were effectively decentralized.

   As far back as 1955, the Restudy Report (A restudy of the Needs of California in Higher Education) had strongly recommended decentralization of accounting and nonacademic personnel
Wellman: administration and had urged considerable decentralization of purchasing and plant planning and construction. But virtually no attention was paid to those recommendations until Kerr became president. Some of the Regents, I recall, were a bit upset by the appraisal in the Restudy Report of the administrative organization of the University including the role of the Regents. They felt that the authors of the restudy had gone beyond their charge and were presumptuous.

In 1952, Allen and Kerr had secured for themselves and for the other chief campus officers jurisdiction over the campus business managers. They had done so by refusing to take office as chancellors until they had such jurisdiction. My impression is that Kerr was the instigator of that move. I attended a meeting in Regent Steinhart's office in San Francisco with Chancellor Kerr, at his (Kerr's) request, at which a change in the Regents' Standing Orders was formulated. I suppose that Kerr asked me to go along since he knew that I was in favor of decentralization and had already moved on it in agriculture.

The amendment to the Standing Orders (adopted by the Regents) appeared to give the chief campus officer more control over campus business operations than it actually did. The amendment started out by saying that "The Business Manager on each campus shall have a 'line relationship' to the local chief administrative officer, and shall administer all business operations on the campus under the direction of the local campus administrative officer"; but then it made an important exception, namely, "except as otherwise provided in the By-Laws or Standing Orders of The Regents." Accounting, architects and engineers, nonacademic personnel, and purchasing remained under University-wide administration.

The conflict between Kerr and Corley, which eventually led to Corley's early retirement (1964), began in 1952 over the decentralization issue. It grew during the years Kerr was chancellor of the Berkeley campus. Kerr wanted control of all of the business operations on his campus as did all of the other chief campus officers. Corley did not want to give them up.

Corley had built a tightly knit, centralized administrative structure. He backed up his staff and looked out for their interests including salaries. They, in turn, were loyal to him. They could do no wrong in Corley's sight, and he could do no wrong in theirs.
Immediately under Corley at the University-wide level were Louis Baker in purchasing; James Miller in plant maintenance, printing, etc.; Boynten Kaiser in nonacademic personnel administration, and Roscoe Weaver in building construction. They were most reluctant to have their staff members, who were located on the campuses, taken away from them and put under the chancellor or provosts.

Accounting was under the controller of the University rather than under the vice-president--business affairs. Raymond Kettler became controller in 1955--Olaf Lundberg had died suddenly in 1953. George Stevens was acting controller from then until Kettler's appointment.

Kettler was sympathetic to decentralization of accounting, and he worked closely and harmoniously with Kerr in getting it done.

Revising the Capital Outlay Budget

Chall: You mentioned that you took an active part in the development of the University's capital outlay budget. What was your role?

Wellman: I was chairman of the Statewide Building and Campus Development Coordinating Committee.

That committee operated much the same under President Kerr as it had under President Sproul. I have already explained its operations when I was chairman of it under President Sproul. However, I might make some additional comments.

Procedures were substantially improved over the years. Campus requests were better documented. Full-day hearings were held on the campuses, and these gave a better opportunity for resolving differences of opinion between the campuses and University-wide than when hearings were held only in Berkeley. The establishment of priorities was aided by computer runs.

Elmo R. Morgan, vice-president--physical planning and construction, added much strength to the committee. He had great ability and worked well with the campus personnel including the chancellors.
Wellman: As vice-president of the University, I had the responsibility for recommending the capital outlay budget to the president. Quite naturally, I did not want to take a building program to him that I could not support wholeheartedly. Hence, I saw to it that the program, which the committee approved, was one that I felt was sound.

I do not recall that a vote was ever taken on any project. Discussion was continued until a consensus was reached. Even though I was chairman, I had no qualms about taking part in the discussions. I did my homework in advance of the meetings so that I knew a good deal about each of the many projects and the relations among them. Also, continuous participation year after year in the development of the capital outlay budget added substantially to my experience and knowledge.

Morgan had the responsibility for presenting and defending the University's capital outlay budget in Sacramento. He did an excellent job. He was highly regarded by the staffs of the State Department of Finance and the legislative analyst and by the legislators with whom he came in contact.

Academic Personnel Administration: Decentralization

First Steps Under President Sproul

Chall: Was there any decentralization in the academic areas before Kerr became president?

Wellman: Yes, some. Shortly after Kerr and Allen took office as chancellors, President Sproul directed the chairmen of departments of instruction and research, the deans of schools and colleges, and the directors of research institutes (except University-wide research institutes such as the Agricultural Experiment Station) to report to the chancellors or provosts. Up to that time they had reported directly to the president.

That delegation strengthened the position of the chief campus officers in that all recommendations for appointments, promotions, and salary increases, and departmental budget recommendations had to come to them. Thus, they were able to review the recommendations and express their judgment on them.
Sproul also delegated to the chief campus officers authority to appoint chairmen of departments of instruction and research, except that chairmen of joint departments in the Division of Agricultural Sciences were appointed by the vice-president--agricultural sciences after consultation with the chief campus officers concerned. I don't recall a single instance of any disagreement under that arrangement.

The 1952 Budget Reform Committee, going beyond its assignment, recommended that authority be given to the president to approve nontenure appointments and promotions and all increases in salaries of individual faculty members except those receiving above-scale salaries. Those recommendations were adopted by the Regents. The details are in the Budget Reform Committee's letter which I have given you for the appendix. None of the authority delegated at that time by the Regents to the president was redelegated by President Sproul to the chief campus officers. That was left for Kerr to do when he became president.

Additional Steps Under President Kerr: Wellman's Role

Chall: President Kerr, I assume, moved promptly in delegating authority in academic areas to the chancellors.

Wellman: Yes, very promptly, I thought.

In his first year as president, he delegated to the chancellors authority over appointments, promotions, and salaries of all nontenure academic personnel. About the only authority over academic personnel which had been delegated to the president by the Regents and which Kerr did not redelegate to the chancellors at that time was salary increases of tenure faculty.

In early 1964, Kerr delegated to the chancellors most of the remaining authority over academic salaries which he had; namely, in-scale merit increases for tenure faculty up to and including Step III of the professorship. Salary Steps IV and V of the professorship had been introduced only a year or two before and were still considered to be exceptional rather than normal steps.
Delegation to the chancellors of authority to approve in-scale merit increases for tenure faculty could have been made earlier and should have. Why I did not recommend an earlier delegation I do not now recall.

After the delegation of in-scale merit increases for the faculty to the campuses, the president's office looked at individual cases on only three occasions (1) appointment or promotion to the associate professorship, (2) appointment or promotion to the professorship, and (3) merit salary increases at Steps IV and V of the professorship and over-scale.

I felt that the delegations made up to that point were entirely justified. There were sufficient controls to prevent any campus from getting much out of line. The campuses were allocated the total number of new positions that could be filled and the total amount of salary money that could be used for them. Also, the campuses were allocated the total sum of money that could be spent on salary increases including those related to promotions as well as in-scale merit increases. Within the total salary increase fund available to them, the campuses could make accelerated salary increases within ranks.

I reviewed for the president all recommendations for appointment or promotion to tenure ranks and all recommendations for salary Steps IV and V over-scale salary increases. Exceptional and controversial cases were brought to his attention. The exceptional cases were those which involved appointment at a higher rank and salary than seemed to me warranted on the basis of the evidence or those which involved more rapid promotion than seemed to me justified by the evidence. The chancellors would sometimes ask us to reconsider our decisions and we always did. On occasion we would reverse our original decision and agree to the appointment or promotion and salary recommended.

The controversial cases were those in which the chancellor disagreed with the campus Academic Senate Budget Committee. Some of the exceptional cases were, of course, also controversial cases, but the controversial cases were not limited to them. They also involved normal cases.

Chall: Did you review the recommendations for tenure appointments and promotions from all of the campuses?

Wellman: Yes.
Chall: Didn't that take a lot of time?

Wellman: Yes, it took quite a bit of time, especially during the spring. If I hadn't had good assistants, I couldn't have reviewed all of the recommendations as thoroughly as I did.

The recommendations from each campus were first gone over by an assistant who provided me with a tabulation showing the recommendations of the department chairman, the dean, the ad hoc Academic Senate Committee, the Budget Committee, and the chancellor; also, whether it was a normal promotion, a delayed promotion, or an accelerated promotion. On normal cases on which all had agreed, I read only the summary of the Budget Committee and the chancellor's statement. Unless I could detect a weakness from that rather brief review, I approved the recommendation. If there appeared to be a weakness, I went back and read the complete report of the Budget Committee.

With regard to the recommendations for accelerated promotion, I read the files rather carefully including the review and appraisal of the ad hoc committee as well as the analysis and recommendation of the Budget Committee and the chancellor's statement.

The most troublesome cases, from my standpoint, were those on which the chancellor disagreed with the recommendation of the Budget Committee. In those cases I read the complete file including the recommendation of the department chairman.

President Kerr had inaugurated a policy of sending a letter to the chancellor with a copy to the campus Budget Committee on each case where we disagreed with either the chancellor or the Budget Committee, or both, and explaining in the letter why we did so. That caused some problems especially in connection with those cases on which the chancellor and the Budget Committee disagreed. We appeared to take sides with one or the other, and, I suspect, although I haven't looked up the record, that we agreed more often with the campus Budget Committee than with the chancellor.

In most of the disagreements between the chancellor and his campus Budget Committee, the Budget Committee had said no, and the chancellor had said yes. I recall only two or three cases, although they may have been more, when the Budget Committee said yes, and the chancellor said no.
Wellman: It wasn't, I think, good practice to explain in writing why we disagreed with the chancellor or the Budget Committee, or both. At least I stopped doing so the year I was acting president. It would have been better if, when we disagreed with the chancellor, we had telephoned him or gone to see him before reaching a final decision. We might have convinced him that we were right and he would then have changed his recommendation. On the other hand, he might have convinced us that he was right, and we would then have changed our recommendation. On several occasions I talked to the chancellor on the telephone or in person, but I didn't do so consistently. I should have.

Also, we should have let the chancellor inform the campus budget committee of the University-wide decision. I am not at all certain that Clark Kerr would agree with my views in this matter.

The third major step in the decentralization of academic personnel administration was taken in January, 1966. It was a big one. The chancellors were delegated authority to make appointments and promotions to tenure ranks and to approve all in-scale merit salary increases. Above-scale salaries still had to have the president's recommendation and the Regents' approval.

Before Kerr could delegate authority to the chancellors to make tenure appointments and promotions, he had to have that authority first delegated to him by the Regents. That was done in December, 1965, but not without some hesitancy. Regent McLaughlin, in particular, felt that it was unwise for the Regents to give up the right to approve and have final authority on tenure appointments.

Chall: Did he give his reasons?

Wellman: The University Bulletin (January 3, 1966) reports McLaughlin as saying that appointing tenure members of the faculty is one of the most serious actions the board takes and that, if he were a member of the faculty, he would rather have his appointment made by the top governing board where the power is.

I had strongly supported the previous delegations to the chancellors to make appointments and promotions to nontenure ranks and to approve in-scale merit increases in the tenure ranks as well as in the nontenure ranks. But I was not in favor of delegating authority to the chancellors to make appointments.
Wellman: and promotions to the tenure ranks. I felt then that all tenure appointments and promotions should be reviewed by the president or by one of the vice-presidents; that such review would help insure maintenance of high standards throughout the University. Whether I was right only time will tell, and it may take a very long time.

In considering whether to award an individual tenure—whether by appointment or promotion—one of two types of mistakes may be made. Decision may be made not to make the appointment or promotion when it should have been made; that is, before the individual denied appointment or promotion goes to another university and subsequently develops into an outstanding scholar and teacher. That type of mistake can be corrected although it may cost money to do so. If a sufficiently high salary is offered, the individual could probably be hired back.

The other type of mistake can seldom be corrected, that is, when the individual awarded tenure turns out to be a poor scholar and teacher. Unless he is grossly incompetent, he cannot be fired. Based upon the cases I have seen, mere incompetence is not, in the opinion of the Academic Senate Committee on Privilege and Tenure, sufficient grounds for dismissal.

In view of the fact that the first type of mistake can usually be corrected while the second type cannot be, I have felt that appointment and/or promotion to tenure deserves the most careful scrutiny by faculty and administrators alike. It is mainly for that reason that I advocated appointments and promotions to tenure ranks should have Regents' approval. If the qualifications of the individual being recommended for a tenure appointment or promotion could be questioned any time by a Regent, the recommendations would be more likely to receive careful review by the president and his staff.

In addition to a possible lowering of the quality of tenure faculty, I was also concerned that awarding of tenure by a chancellor of a campus could come to mean that a person would have tenure only on that campus. That would be, it seemed to me, a disadvantage, both to the University and to the individual.

In the statewide College of Agriculture and the Agricultural Experiment Station, tenure was considered to be in the University rather than on a particular campus. Consequently, a person could
Wellman: be transferred from one campus to another without violating his tenure. Over the years quite a few members of the faculty in the College of Agriculture were transferred from one campus to another when, in the opinion of the administrators, it was determined to be desirable to do so from the standpoint of the program of the college. Efforts were, of course, made to persuade the individuals to accept such transfers gracefully.

The concept of tenure in the University rather than on a particular campus was of substantial benefit to faculty members whose line of work had been discontinued on a campus as was done in 1960 in the case of agriculture on the Los Angeles campus. Those individuals had a right to a similar position on another campus if there was an opening on the other campus even though the department on the other campus may have preferred someone else.

Although I didn't like the idea of delegating authority for tenure appointments and promotions, I naturally went along with it once Kerr had decided to recommend it to the Regents. In fact, I felt that Kerr's decision was a reasonable one from his standpoint under the circumstances that prevailed at that time, and I may even have encouraged him to make it.

The Effects of the Free Speech Movement

Chall: What circumstances do you have in mind?

Wellman: The main circumstance, I think, was the free speech movement and Kerr's involvement in it. The solid position which he held with the large majority of the Regents at the start of the free speech movement was eroded by the constant turmoil on the Berkeley campus. That erosion was deepened and widened by his action at a press conference in announcing jointly with Martin Meyerson, acting chancellor of the Berkeley campus, his intention to resign. He did so without notifying the Regents in advance. That angered quite a few of them and further weakened his standing with them. That threat to resign was, in my opinion, the most serious mistake in judgment that Kerr made during his entire career as president of the University. I am also of the opinion that Meyerson's part in that affair kept him from being chosen by the Regents as chancellor of the Berkeley campus.
Wellman: Incidentally, I was not in Berkeley at the time Kerr and Meyerson announced their intention to resign. I was in the Fiji Islands on vacation. Ruth and I had left Berkeley on March 4, my birthday, for an extended vacation trip to the South Pacific and the Far East. We were at Coroleuva Beach in the Fiji Islands when I received a cable giving in full the statements which Kerr and Meyerson had made immediately after their press conference to the Regents, the vice-presidents, and the chancellors. I was told at the Coroleuva Beach Hotel office that it was the longest cable that they had ever received. I was, of course, much disturbed.

Ruth and I walked the beach for several hours debating what to do. I was inclined to return to Berkeley; she insisted that we go on. She won. She stated correctly that I hadn't had a real vacation for several years and that, if we didn't go on, it might be a long time before we again had the opportunity of seeing Australia, New Zealand, the Philippine Islands, Taiwan, and spending two weeks in Japan.

A week before we were scheduled to return, while we were still in Japan, I received a cable from Kerr asking me to return at once. I telephoned him to see whether it would be satisfactory for me to stay in Japan another week. He was called out of a meeting of a committee of the Regents to answer my telephone call. He said the Regents desired me to return immediately, and he urged me to do so. So I did.

Another circumstance was Franklin Murphy's success over the years in persuading the Regents of the desirability of greater campus autonomy. Murphy was chancellor of UCLA and, from the day of his appointment, had been an outspoken advocate of decentralization of administration to the campuses.

Chall: What was the position of the other chancellors on decentralization?

Wellman: The other chancellors were, and I think quite naturally, in favor of greater decentralization. But, with the exception of John Galbraith, chancellor of the San Diego campus, they were not as insistent on it. Galbraith had joined Murphy in demanding almost complete campus autonomy.
The Effect of the Byrne Report

Wellman: The position of those chancellors and Regents who favored a large degree of decentralization was strengthened by the Byrne Report.

Early in 1965, the Regents authorized the appointment of a special committee of Regents "to research basic factors contributing to recent unrest within the University of California, giving particular attention to the disturbances on the Berkeley campus." The chairman of the committee was William E. Forbes, a graduate of UCLA and past president of the UCLA Alumni Association. The Forbes Committee hired a young Los Angeles attorney named Jerome C. Byrne to make the study. I met Byrne but didn't have much conversation with him.

Subsequently, there was debate among the members of the Forbes Committee as to whether Byrne was an employee of the committee and hence should operate under the jurisdiction of the committee or whether he was a consultant hired to make an independent study for the committee. Byrne, himself, took the position that he was employed as a consultant and that, consequently, he was not obligated to clear his recommendations with the committee.

The Byrne Report came out in early May, 1965. When I read it, I felt that it was so far fetched that nobody would pay any attention to it.

But I was wrong. At the first meeting of the Council of Chancellors following the release of the Byrne Report, I proposed that the chancellors go on record opposing it. Chancellors Murphy and Galbraith objected to that proposal. None of the other chancellors supported it; consequently I dropped it.

The assignment of the Forbes Committee was to determine the basic factors contributing to recent unrest within the University of California, giving particular attention to the disturbances on the Berkeley campus. This was presumably the assignment which the committee gave to Mr. Byrne. Byrne's recommendations, however, bore little relation to the findings about student unrest. Rather, they dealt mainly with changes that he felt should be made in the organization of the University and its administration. My own opinion is that,
Wellman: if Byrne's recommendations had been in effect in 1964 and 1965, there would have been the same kind and degree of unrest within the University of California and the same kind and degree of disturbances on the Berkeley campus that did occur.

I would like to quote several of the recommendations in the Byrne Report. I realize that I may be a bit unfair in selecting these recommendations; but they do, I think, give the flavor and the intent of the report. The first recommendation reads (page 74): "We recommend that The Regents separately charter each campus as an autonomous University within the system of higher learning under regional jurisdiction." That is followed by the recommendation "that all powers and authority necessary to self-government and self-determination be placed with the Chancellors, faculty, and students of the individual University, preserving to The Regents and the President only those powers and authority essential to constitutional unity of the whole." Then, on page 81, "we recommend that the Presidency and the Chairmanship of The Regents be merged into one, with the President serving as ex officio Chairman of The Regents and having powers now vested in the Chairman."

Chall: That appears to be total decentralization—was that what Chancellors Murphy and Galbraith approved?

Wellman: I am not certain that they would have gone that far, but my impression is that they would have gone quite a distance. I heard Chancellor Murphy talk about a commonwealth of campuses and about the president becoming chairman of the board. My impression is that Byrne got many of his ideas from Chancellor Murphy.

The delegation to the campuses of authority to appoint and promote to tenure ranks (issued January 18, 1966) reserved three items for University-wide approval: (1) appointments and salary increases at over-scale salary, (2) the salary to be paid when two or more campuses of the University sought the services of the same individual at the tenure level, and (3) recruitment from another institution of higher education in California of a person who is holding or will be offered by the University the rank of associate professor or professor.

Chall: Why were those three items reserved?

Wellman: Appointment and merit increase to an over-scale salary was intended to be limited to exceptional cases to those faculty
Wellman: members of the highest distinction. In order to maintain reasonable conformity among the campuses, it seemed desirable to have over-scale appointments and merit increases reviewed and recommended to the Regents by the president. The Regents needed to be assured that only persons of the highest distinction and who had the most careful scrutiny would be accorded over-scale salaries.

The requirement that the president approve the salary to be paid, when two or more campuses of the University sought the services of the same individual at the tenure level, was to prevent serious overbidding of one campus against another and especially to prevent the two major campuses—Berkeley and Los Angeles—from robbing the others. Also, we in the University-wide administration thought that it was desirable for the new campuses to recruit faculty members with experience in the University so that the policies and traditions of the University would become known and observed on the newer campuses.

The requirement that University-wide approve, before negotiations are initiated, the recruitment from another institution of higher education in California of a person who is holding or will be offered by the University the rank of associate professor or professor was put in to prevent the raiding of other institutions of higher education in California by the University.

That requirement came out of a situation in which a department at UCLA had recruited five members from the same department at USC and had offered those members salaries which had averaged $1,500 to $2,000 more a year than they were receiving at USC. That incident caused some problems for us in the legislature. Later when he became governor Mr. Reagan referred to it as one reason why the University of California faculty didn't need a salary increase. The University he claimed was already paying higher salaries than competing institutions in the state.

The University of California faculty and the Academic Senate committees didn't like that restriction. They felt that it was holding down salaries and interfering with the market for academic personnel. And, of course, it was. We in the University-wide administration felt that any widespread effort to attract faculty members from other institutions in the state by means of higher salaries would adversely affect
Wellman: the University as a whole even though such action might be fully justified from the standpoint of the department or departments concerned.

I have been talking about decentralization of academic personnel administration approved by the Regents in December, 1965, and carried out by the president in January, 1966. But there were also other important delegations approved by the Regents and made by the president at those times relating to, namely, nonacademic and administrative personnel, admissions, business services, public ceremonies, budget administration, grants and contracts, grounds and buildings, student housing and other loan construction projects, and summer sessions.

Some Concluding Thoughts on Decentralization

Wellman: A chronology of the major steps taken in the decentralization of the administration of the University of California for the period 1958-1966 is contained in a published report of the president entitled "Development and Decentralization: The Administration of the University of California, 1958-1966." Anyone reviewing that document must, I think, come to the conclusion that great progress in the decentralization of the University was made in a very short time. Sure, there were tensions and disagreements but, on the whole, I think they were worked out amicably. They went far toward meeting the desires of the chancellors. If anything, decentralization may have been carried too far from the standpoint of the most efficient operation of the University, and some recentralization may be found to be desirable some time in the future.
Participation in Other Areas

Planning for University-wide Growth

Chall: Can you tell me how the planning for the future of the University was undertaken?

Wellman: Yes, but not too much. My personal participation in planning the University's future was quite limited.

I have already mentioned that I was a member of the committees that recommended the expansion of the Davis campus to include a College of Letters and Science and the establishment of a College of Letters and Science at Riverside which up to that time was limited to a specialized agricultural research institute, the Citrus Experiment Station. Those two developments came out of the Strayer Committee Report on the Needs of California in Higher Education published in 1948.

I have also mentioned my participation in the Regents' decision of August, 1957, to establish a general campus in the San Diego area.

Immediately following that Regents' meeting, a three-day conference was held, also at Lake Arrowhead, attended by Regents, University-wide administrators (except President Sproul who was ill), chief campus officers, and selected faculty members. There was extended discussion of the need for additional University campuses.

The previous year (1956), the joint staff of the Liaison Committee of the California State Board of Education and the Regents of the University of California had made "A Study of the Need for Additional Centers of Public Higher Education in California" in which it recommended the establishment of full-scale University campuses in the San Diego area, the southeast Los Angeles County-Orange County area, and the South Central Coast area.

At the conference, Dean E. McHenry, at that time professor of political science on the UCLA campus, made a particularly persuasive presentation of the need for additional University campuses. He had been the chairman of a study committee at the
All-University Faculty Conference held in the spring of 1957 which dealt with the size and number of campuses. The McHenry Committee strongly urged the establishment of four new University campuses—one in the San Joaquin Valley in addition to the three I have mentioned—and the Faculty Conference enthusiastically endorsed those proposals.

At the October, 1957, meeting of the Regents, the same meeting at which Kerr was elected president, the Regents' Committee on Educational Policy recommended and the board approved the establishment of two large campuses in addition to the one in the San Diego area, namely, one in the southeast Los Angeles County-Orange County area and the other in the South Central Coast area. Their approval was subject to the availability of adequate sites on satisfactory terms.

Thus, planning for the future expansion of the University was started under President Sproul. It was largely carried out under President Kerr.

Kerr played the leading role in the acquisition of sites for the San Diego, Irvine, and Santa Cruz campuses and in the development of the physical and academic plans for them. He also played a leading role in the development of plans for the expansion of the Davis, Riverside, and Santa Barbara campuses.

Were you involved in developing the Master Plan for Higher Education?

Yes, but not extensively. I was one of the four University members of the Joint Advisory Committee under the Master Plan Survey Team. The other three University members were Chancellors Samuel B. Gould, Santa Barbara campus; Emil M. Mrak, Davis campus; and Herman T. Spieth, Riverside campus.

Dean E. McHenry was the University's representative on the Master Plan Survey Team. He did a grand job.

In addition to the four University members, the Joint Advisory Committee consisted of four members from the state colleges (three presidents and the state associate superintendent
Wellman: of public instruction), four members from the junior colleges (three presidents and the chief of the Bureau of Junior Colleges of the State Department of Education), and four members from the independent colleges and universities (all presidents).

Chall: What did the Joint Advisory Committee do?

Wellman: It was assigned the function of developing an acceptable plan for differentiation of functions as between the University, the state colleges, and the junior colleges. There was no problem on reaching an agreement on differentiation of functions between the University and the junior colleges. There was only a minor problem regarding differentiation of functions between the state colleges and the junior colleges. But there was a major problem on differentiation of functions between the University and the state colleges, namely, whether the state colleges would be permitted to offer the doctor's degree.

No agreement was reached on that issue by the Joint Advisory Committee. The three state college presidents—Malcolm A. Love, San Diego State College; John T. Wahlquist, San Jose State College; and Guy A. West, Sacramento State College—were strongly in favor. Love was a very effective spokesman for his group.

The University members were opposed. We felt that such a move would, in the long run, drain state support for graduate instruction from the University and hence would seriously weaken the quality of graduate instruction offered by the University, and that the state colleges themselves would not get enough state funds for first-rate doctoral programs.

Two of the initial University members of the Joint Advisory Committee—Chancellor Glen Seaborg and Chancellor Stanley Freeborn—were inclined toward giving the state colleges the right to grant doctoral degrees. Also, quite a few prominent faculty members of the University were sympathetic to that viewpoint. It had become a firm article of faith among many of them that active participation in research was essential for good teaching, that a person could not be a good teacher unless he was also a good researcher. That claim was made not only with respect to graduate instruction for the doctor's degree but also graduate instruction for the master's degree and even for undergraduate instruction at the upper division level.

Chall: As I understand it, work on the Master Plan almost became unglued until it was decided at the last minute to allow a joint Ph.D.
Wellman: Yes, the proposal that the state colleges may award the doctoral degree jointly with the University of California saved the Master Plan.

Chall: Who came up with the idea of a joint doctorate?

Wellman: I believe that Kerr did. I was not at the meeting at which it was done, but I was told that Kerr made the proposal. Whether he got the idea from someone else, I do not know. He did not get it from me or from any other member of the Joint Advisory Committee.

Kerr had the ability of coming up with good ideas at just the right time. In connection with the Master Plan, for example, Kerr suggested the appointment of Arthur E. Coons, president of Occidental College, as chairman of the Master Plan Survey Team; and he suggested to Roy E. Simpson, superintendent of public instruction, the structure of the proposed coordinating agency—the Coordinating Council for Higher Education. Simpson presented it, as I recall, at a joint meeting of the Regents and the State Board of Education; and it was accepted by both groups. Prior to that time, there had been disagreement over the structure.

Chall: Kerr's relations with Roy Simpson were good enough so they could work together without friction?

Wellman: I never observed the slightest friction between them. As superintendent of public instruction, Simpson had more to do with secondary education than with higher education; but he had broad interests in all education. He was a strong supporter of the Master Plan.

Chall: Now, tell me about Miss Dorothy M. Donahoe. She seems to have been an important link in bringing about the development of the Master Plan.

Wellman: She was a very important link and a most capable woman. I did not know her personally, but I saw her and heard her on several occasions. The report of the Master Plan Survey Team is dedicated to her. She was a member of the state assembly at the time and a very influential one as far as public education was concerned. It is, I think, fair to say that she, more than any other assemblyman, was responsible for initiating the Master Plan study and for getting most of its recommendations adopted by the assembly.
Chall: Now, George Miller, Jr., was also apparently important in this matter of legislation. What was his major concern?

Wellman: He was certainly a powerful senator. From the few conversations I had with him and from what Jim Corley told me, Miller was concerned with promoting an outstanding system of higher education in the state without needless duplication and proliferation. He wanted a good system of higher education in California, but he wanted it without unnecessary expense.

One time I attended a meeting in Sacramento called at the request of James Conant, former president of Harvard University. George Miller, Jr., was there as was also Glenn S. Dumke, chancellor of the state college system. Dumke said something about the need for the state colleges to award the doctor's degree. And Miller said, "Chancellor Dumke, the state colleges are not going to get the doctor's degree." And then he turned to me and said, "The University is not going to get additional campuses." At that time we were thinking about two additional campuses—one in the San Fernando Valley and one in the North Bay area.

Miller's view was that the University should concentrate on graduate instruction and that it already had enough campuses for that purpose. He was equally sure that the state colleges should concentrate on undergraduate instruction. If there should be need for additional undergraduate centers in the state, and he was not convinced that there was, they should be state colleges.

All-University Faculty Conferences

Chall: You mentioned that the need for new University campuses was discussed at the 1957 All-University Faculty Conference. I would like to know something about those conferences.

Wellman: They were started by President Sproul. The first one was held in 1944 and the second one was held in 1947; thereafter, they were held annually. I did not attend the first two, but I attended most of the subsequent ones up to the time I retired. Also, I went to one after I retired. I probably attended more All-University Faculty Conferences than anyone else, at least up to this time.
Wellman: Perhaps I should explain why I happened to go to so many. The first few I attended was as a faculty member. The normal procedure was for a faculty member to attend three successive conferences but no more. Thus, at each conference after the first two, one-third of the members would be new, one-third would have attended one previous conference, and one-third would have attended two previous conferences.

The faculty members were invited to the conference by the president of the University from a list submitted to him by the Conference Steering Committee which he had appointed sometime before. I was chairman of the steering committee for the 1952 conference. Attendance was limited to around 125 people, give or take a few.

During the years I was vice-president—agricultural sciences, I attended the annual conferences at the request of President Sproul; during the years I was vice-president of the University, I attended them at the request of President Kerr. Both Sproul and Kerr felt that the vice-presidents and chief campus officers should attend the All-University Faculty Conferences at least for a part of the time.

Chall: Were those conferences useful, do you think?

Wellman: Yes, I think they were. They brought faculty members together from different campuses who got acquainted with each other—perhaps more in informal discussions outside the sessions than in the sessions. Also, the fact that they were All-University Conferences helped preserve the idea that the University of California was one University. Then the topics that were discussed were important ones, and the resolutions which were adopted by the conferences had some influence on the University's subsequent actions.

Every conference which I attended adopted a resolution requesting continuation of the conferences. The 1967 conference, for example, the one held the year I was acting president—adopted a resolution which reads, and I quote:

"In view of the continued growth of the University and the constant rise of campus autonomy, the All-University Faculty Conference is an increasingly important expression of unity. We recommend continuance of the Conference."
Wellman: That recommendation for continuance came at the end of the twenty-first All-University Faculty Conference. They had been held annually for many years and, as far as I know, are still being held.

Chall: Were the conferences on-going; that is, did they have committees that worked on problems between sessions?

Wellman: Yes. Each conference had a steering committee and several study committees appointed by the president of the University. Members of the next year's steering committee were usually selected from a list of persons submitted by the previous year's steering committee. The new steering committee recommended to the president a general topic with appropriate subtopics for the next conference. Following approval by the president (and, as far as I know, he always approved—maybe with some modifications), the steering committee nominated members to each of the study committees for the approved subtopics. And when appointed by the president, usually early in the fall, the study committees commenced work on their reports which were sent to the conference members several weeks in advance of the meeting. The conferences were set up as working conferences, and it was hoped, more by Sproul than by Kerr, that those attending them would participate.

Sproul and Kerr: Styles Compared

Wellman: The common rumor at the conferences under Sproul was that he kept a record of the number of times a person participated; if he did not participate at all, he was not invited back again.

Chall: You mean the number of times he spoke?

Wellman: Yes, that's what I mean. I do not know for a fact whether Sproul did that consistently, but I do recall that at one conference the names of the delegates with the number of times they had spoken were posted at the entrance to the conference room before the beginning of the last session.

Kerr was not much concerned whether an individual spoke up or not. Possibly owing to his Quaker background, he felt that, unless the spirit moved him, what a person said was not worth saying or listening to.
Wellman: One of the highlights of the All-University Faculty Conferences, especially under Kerr, was the question-box session held in the evening following a cocktail party and a good dinner.

Sproul always insisted that questions be sent to him in advance of the conference, and he had written replies prepared by his staff or by himself. In my capacity as vice-president--agricultural sciences, I prepared replies on several occasions to questions relating to the Division of Agricultural Sciences. The written questions and written answers were then read. I had the feeling that, during and following the loyalty oath controversy, Sproul did not want one of his off-the-cuff answers thrown back at him by some unfriendly Regent who might have heard about it.

Kerr, on the other hand, invited questions from the floor; none was submitted in advance of the session or in writing. That made for a much livelier and more interesting session.

Chall: If he did not know the answer, would he refer it to someone?

Wellman: Yes, but he seldom had to. He had a broad knowledge of virtually all of the University's operations, policies, and problems; and he had a detailed knowledge of many of them. On several occasions he asked me, or one of the other vice-presidents, to supplement his answers. If the question concerned a particular situation on a campus, he asked the chancellor of that campus, if he was present, to comment.

Kerr was especially adept at fielding questions, constantly to my amazement and to the amazement of most, if not all, of those present at the question-box sessions.

When the time came for the 1967 All-University Faculty Conference held in March that year, I was a bit worried about what to do at the question-box session. President Kerr had been summarily fired just two months before, and I knew that the delegates would want to ask many questions about it--questions which I could not answer. The solution I hit on was to ask Regent Philip L. Boyd, who was attending the conference, to handle those questions. He agreed.

Boyd was a dedicated Regent. He had performed many valuable services for the University and had devoted many hours to the University between meetings of the Regents. For example, he was
Wellman: chairman of the special Regents' Committee on Selection of New Campus Sites at the time the San Diego, Irvine, and Santa Cruz sites were chosen. He had high regard and praise for Kerr's performance as president, except with respect to the free-speech episode. However, he felt that Kerr could no longer serve the University well as its president, and he had voted to dismiss him.

Boyd's performance at the question-box session, I thought, was exceptionally good. He was forthright in his answers to difficult questions, and he didn't try to evade even embarrassing questions. I doubt that he convinced anybody that the Regents had made a good decision; but he did, I think, persuade quite a few that he and other moderate Regents who had voted to dismiss Kerr had done so out of what they thought were the best interests of the University and not from political considerations.

Plans for Year-round Operation

Chall: Did you have any comments on year-round operation?

Wellman: Yes, I could make some comments. I was involved to some extent, not as a principal but as one of the participants. Also, I had the opportunity of observing what happened as it happened.

I would not characterize our efforts to operate on a year-round basis as the most successful of the operations we undertook during the years I was vice-president of the University; far from it. Year-round operations had a protracted and painful birth and a short and restricted life. There were few mourners at the internment. It seemed like a good idea at the time, but it did not work out well despite the expenditure of much time and effort and quite a bit of money.

In the fall of 1960, the Regents instructed the University administration to undertake year-round operation. At one meeting of the Regents, President Kerr was commenting on some of the academic problems which the faculty felt would be created or aggravated by year-round operation. One Regent--I do not remember whom--replied that, if University faculty members could devise an atomic bomb, they could surely devise a sound plan for year-round operation.
Wellman: The Regents looked upon year-round operation as a means of reducing the large amount of funds needed for expansion of facilities to accommodate the ever-growing enrollment. If by increasing the use of existing facilities during the slack period of the year (the summer months) more students could be educated in those facilities, and, hence, the amount of additional facilities that had to be built would be smaller, state funds for capital outlay would thereby be saved. As responsible trustees, the Regents felt duty bound to avoid unnecessary expenditures of public funds.

The first proposal of the University-wide administration was a hybrid calendar--two regular semesters of 16 weeks each and a shorter summer term of 12 weeks (a 16-16-12 calendar). The combined Educational Policy Committees of the Academic Senate, to which the proposal had been referred, recommended that the shorter summer term be divided into two 6-week sessions (a 16-16-6-6 calendar). This latter calendar was identical to the one that the Berkeley campus had had for many years--two regular semesters of 16 weeks each followed by an intersession of 6 weeks which, in turn, was followed by a summer session of 6 weeks.

That calendar was in effect when I came to the Berkeley campus as a graduate student in the summer of 1923. How much earlier than that it had been in effect, I do not know. The intersessions were mainly for UC undergraduate students who needed to make up deficiencies or who wanted to accelerate their programs. The summer sessions were attended by many persons who had already received a baccalaureate degree. Undergraduate students, including those who were not eligible for admission to the regular semesters, were also admitted to summer session courses.

A 16-16-6-6 calendar to go into effect in 1962-63 was recommended to the Regents at their February, 1961, meeting. They approved it but not with much enthusiasm. Most of them at that time preferred a 16-16-12 calendar, and it also was authorized for any campus that wanted to employ it.

That fall (1961), the Regents requested an additional $3,600,000 for the 1963 summer term. It was approved by the Governor and the state legislature. It seemed then that a year-round operation would soon be a reality. But that was not to be.
The University administration began to have second thoughts. The proposal for two 6-week terms, although originally urged by the combined Academic Senate Committee on Educational Policy, was said by influential members of the faculty to be too short for high-quality education especially in the humanities and social sciences.

Acceptance of that position forced the University administration back to the 16-16-12 calendar—the one it had proposed originally. However, that calendar ran into a roadblock. The thesis was advanced that each of the three terms should be manned mainly by regular faculty members in order to maintain educational quality; that faculty members should teach only two terms out of the year; and that their annual salary should be the same for teaching a 16-week term, plus a 12-week term as for teaching two 16-week terms.

I objected to that proposal. Based on my experience in Sacramento, I was certain that it would not fly; that 16 weeks' pay for 12 weeks' work would not be accepted by the state legislature even if it had the approval of the Regents. And I was reasonably confident that the Regents would not approve it. President Kerr accepted that position.

Having rejected the original calendar proposals for a year-round operation, a different one had to be devised. But, by then, time was too short to put one into effect for 1962-63. The Regents agreed to a delay—first to the academic year 1964-65 and later to the academic year 1966-67. The $3,600,000 appropriated by the state legislature for the 1963 summer term was returned.

The main issue to be resolved was the type of calendar to be adopted—whether the trimester system or the quarter system; whether three equal terms or four equal terms.

Many groups were consulted—faculty, students, junior colleges, and state agencies (the Coordinating Council for Higher Education, the State Department of Finance, the Office of the Legislative Analyst, and the state legislature). The Regents were kept fully informed of the progress (or lack of progress) being made, and periodic status reports were published in the University Bulletin for the information of all faculty members.

There were complaints by some faculty members, particularly on the Berkeley campus, that in moving toward a year-round
Wellman: operation the faculty had not been sufficiently consulted. That charge seemed to me to be entirely unfounded. I do not recall any other academic issue on which faculty members were more widely or more frequently consulted.

A few days before I left on a vacation trip to the South Pacific, early in March, 1965, I made a statement at a meeting of the Berkeley Division of the Academic Senate in which I recited "chapter and verse" regarding the extensive consultations that had been held with official committees of the Academic Senate and the comprehensive reports that had been published in the University Bulletin. But I did not make much of an impression. The division adopted a resolution requesting that the quarter system, scheduled to go into effect in September, 1966, be postponed for one year in order to permit further study of the relative merits and demerits of alternative calendars.

I had the feeling that the request for further delay was motivated more by opposition to year-round operation per se than by the need for further study of the two systems. Both had already been studied in depth, and it is doubtful that an additional year's study would have turned up anything new and important.

The proponents of the trimester system had agreed, in response to one of the major criticisms of it, to a division of the summer term into two 8-week sessions, thus accepting a calendar of 16-16-8-8 weeks. That did not then and does not now seem to me to be greatly inferior from the standpoint of quality of education to the 16-16-6-6 weeks' calendar originally proposed.

The Regents rejected the request of the Berkeley Division of the Academic Senate for a further delay in the start of a year-round operation and ordered that the quarter calendar be instituted on all campuses in 1966-67 and that year-round operation be instituted on one or more campuses in the academic year 1967-68. In compliance with that order, the older campuses converted to the quarter calendar in September, 1966, and a summer quarter was instituted on the Berkeley campus in June, 1967. The new campuses had started on the quarter system. Thus, four years after the year-round operation was originally scheduled to start, it became a reality.
Wellman: During that interval, President Kerr pressed for improvement in undergraduate education. He felt that the change to a year-round operation should provide the opportunity for improvement. At his request the Regents appropriated $500,000 to be allocated by Kerr to the campuses for studies designed to improve undergraduate education. The funds were allocated, on the requests of the chancellors, and studies were made.

I have not looked up the studies and, hence, cannot comment on them; that is, whether they proposed significant ways of improving undergraduate education. As I recall, no study was directed to what I considered then, and still do, an important way of improving undergraduate instruction, namely, recognition of undergraduate instruction as a basis for salary increases and promotion.

The problem, of course, was and perhaps still is how to evaluate undergraduate instruction. A part of the $500,000 might well have been used to devise reliable measures for doing so. But I cannot recall that any funds were used for that purpose. I believe that the administration, the chancellors, and the president would have given greater weight to excellence in teaching if they had been provided with reliable evidence.

Critique of the Plans and Decisions

Chall: This may not be a fair question, so don't answer it if you don't want to. But, in retrospect, do you think anything should have been done that wasn't done with respect to year-round operation?

Wellman: If I were discreet, I wouldn't answer. But since I don't have to be discreet now, I'll venture a reply.

In the light of what we knew then, the principal mistake, as I see it now, was to have delayed the start of the year-round operation as long as we did; or, perhaps I should say, to have permitted that long a delay even though the faculty urged it. A quarter system could have been introduced in the fall of 1964 with a summer quarter in 1965. That would have helped considerably in meeting the increased enrollments then and for the next few years since the new campuses were just getting started.
On the other hand, if we had known back in 1961 that student enrollments would start leveling off within 10 years—a situation that no one predicted—we should have stayed with the two 6-week summer terms originally scheduled for 1963. While some of my faculty friends may dispute it, I have a hunch that it would have been possible and feasible to have provided quality instruction for undergraduate students under the 16-16-6-6 calendar. Also, I suspect, although I cannot prove it, that summer enrollment of undergraduate students would have been as large under the 16-16-6-6 calendar as under the 12-12-12-12 calendar.

But, as I have said, no one, as far as I know, predicted at that time a marked slowing down in student enrollment in the foreseeable future. The 1965 University Growth Plan predicted that total University of California enrollment would reach 107,000 in 1970, 137,000 in 1975-76, and continue on upward for many years thereafter. In consequence the University was concerned with developing a sound year-round operation for the long run rather than an acceptable expedient for the short run.

The University budget request for 1967-68, submitted to the Regents in the fall of 1966, contained an item of $5 million earmarked for the year-round operation starting at Berkeley in the summer of 1967 and at Los Angeles in the summer of 1968. At that meeting President Kerr presented an estimate that by 1975 a year-round operation would save the University about $100 million in capital outlay expenditures. I do not remember just how that sum was arrived at, but I undoubtedly reviewed it at the time and found it plausible.

A summer quarter was started on the Berkeley campus in 1967 and on the Los Angeles campus in 1968. They were continued through the summer of 1969.

One other comment or maybe two. At the time the move for year-round operation was launched, I do not think that we, in the University administration, fully realized the extent to which University facilities were actually being used during the summer months. There was, of course, a record of student enrollment in both the intersession and summer session. But there were also many graduate students on campus who were not registered but who were engaged in research or in independent study under the general supervision of a faculty member and were making progress toward a degree.
Wellman: Also, we did not realize how much more space would be required for a year-round operation under the quarter system (or under the trimester system). We knew that no more space in classrooms and student laboratories would be required; but we overlooked the additional space that would be required by the additional regular faculty members, mainly for offices and research facilities.

Year-round operation under the quarter system contemplated that a substantial portion of the teachers in the summer quarter would be regular faculty members but that no faculty member would teach more than three quarters. More regular faculty members would be needed; and those teaching the summer quarter along with two other quarters would require the same amount and kind of space as those teaching the fall, winter, and spring quarters.

Under the 16-16-6-6 calendar in effect at Berkeley for many years before the changeover, the intersession was manned mainly by regular faculty members who continued to occupy their assigned space during that period. The summer sessions were manned partly by regular faculty members and partly by visiting faculty members (in what proportion I do not know). The former continued to occupy their assigned space; the latter used such space as could be borrowed for them by the department chairmen.

Visiting faculty in the short summer terms were not expected to engage in research or serve on University committees. They required some office space, but, when necessary, they could and did share offices. Department chairmen could always or almost always borrow offices from regular faculty members who were absent from the campus for all or part of a summer term.

During the years I was a member of the University-wide Coordinating Committee on Buildings and Campus Development, I do not recall that we received a single request for space for visiting faculty members employed to teach in either the intersession or the summer session. On the other hand, additional space was requested to provide both office and research space for the augmented number of regular faculty members that would be called upon to teach in the summer quarter under the year-round operation.
The Free Speech Movement

Chall: I would like to turn now to the Free Speech Movement and to your involvement in it.

Wellman: Actually, I was not involved in it in any significant way at all. I was busy "keeping the store" while that turmoil was going on.

Chall: I understand that Dr. Kerr was out of town when the famous September 14, 1964, directive was issued by the Berkeley campus regarding the twenty-six foot strip on Bancroft Avenue. Did you know anything about that? Were you aware of what was going on?

Wellman: Yes, Kerr was out of town; and no, I didn't know anything about that directive.*

I first became aware that a serious problem was developing when I was told at a retirement reception, being given in the Alumni House in the afternoon (I don't recall now whom it was for), that a very large protest rally by students was being held in Sproul Plaza.

Chall: That was the first one?

Wellman: Yes, at least the first big one.

President Kerr came to the reception a little before five o'clock. He asked me to stay after it was over and meet with him and Chancellor Strong. Strong was accompanied by Alex C. Sherriffs, vice-chancellor--student affairs, and Miss Kitty Malloy.

Chall: Who was Miss Malloy?

Wellman: She was, I believe, a senior administrative assistant in the chancellor's office; she may have been there when Kerr was chancellor. She was a capable person and quite outspoken.

The only suggestion I made at that conference was that Kerr and Strong get the president of the ASUC and the editor of the Daily Californian to meet immediately with them in Strong's office and try to work out a mutually agreeable solution.

*At the July, 1964, meeting of the President's Council of Chancellors in University house on the Berkeley campus, Kerr, who had recently returned from an eastern trip, reported that student unrest would likely be fomented by an activist group and that the Berkeley campus could be an early target. He warned the chancellors to be on their guard.
Wellman: I left before the conference broke up to attend a dinner being given by Regent Donald McLaughlin for John W. Oswald who had recently been appointed president of the University of Kentucky.

I was told sometime later that my suggestion was not followed; that Alex Sherriffs and Miss Malloy, in particular, objected to doing so. Why, I don't know.

Chall: Were you available to talk to the Regents or as a liaison with Chancellor Strong at any time? Did you talk to the faculty?

Wellman: I met with a committee of the Regents shortly after the Academic Senate meeting on December 8, 1964. It was at their invitation. They asked me a number of questions about what had happened at that meeting and at the Greek Theater meeting.

I did not serve as a liaison between President Kerr and Chancellor Strong, although I talked with Chancellor Strong once or twice about some aspects of FSM.

I talked with individual faculty members but not with any faculty committee.

Chall: Did you attend the meeting in the Greek Theater at which Professor Robert Scalapino and President Kerr spoke?

Wellman: Yes, I was there. They explained the agreement which the Regents and the department chairmen had approved. I thought that they both did an exceptional job and, when they had finished, I felt for a moment that a solution to the difficulty had finally been found, but only for a moment. Mario Savio rushed to the microphone; he was dragged away by policemen. That destroyed all of the good that Scalapino and Kerr had done.

Chall: Apparently, promises had been made that there would be no police there at all?

Wellman: Kerr told me that he had given instructions that there were to be no police in sight at the Greek Theater meeting. Why his instructions were disregarded, I don't know; I never inquired.
Response of the Faculty

Chall: Did you attend the Academic Senate meeting held in Wheeler Auditorium on December 8, 1964?

Wellman: Yes, I attended it. The vote of the faculty that day in support of the resolutions of the Faculty Committee of Two Hundred was, I feel, an important factor in the subsequent dismissal of President Kerr.

Chall: Why was that?

Wellman: The faculty turned down by an overwhelming vote an agreement that had been reached by the Regents and a committee of departmental chairmen in favor of the resolutions of the Faculty Committee of Two Hundred and, in doing so, repudiated President Kerr. They, in effect, announced publicly that they had lost confidence in him. That action gave further support to those Regents who wanted to dismiss him. Several of my good friends on the faculty told me afterwards that, in voting for the resolutions of the Faculty Committee of Two Hundred, they had not intended to weaken President Kerr's position. Whether they intended to or not, that was the practical effect.

Chall: I understand that President Kerr did not attend the Academic Senate meeting.

Wellman: No, he did not attend it.

Chall: Why didn't he?

Wellman: I don't know. I had urged him to attend, and I thought he was going to up until about an hour before the meeting started.

Chall: Would his attendance have made any difference in the outcome of the meeting do you think?

Wellman: No, I don't think so. The vote would probably have been closer, but it would still have been decisively in favor of the resolutions of the Faculty Committee of Two Hundred.

When Kerr decided not to attend the meeting, he wrote out a brief statement and asked me to read it if anyone asked what his position was. No one asked specifically. Consequently,
Wellman:  I didn't read his statement. One or two speakers stated what they thought Kerr's position was. I could, of course, have taken advantage of that opportunity and read his statement. But I didn't do so. I didn't think it would have any influence on the outcome of the meeting or would do Kerr any good.

Chall:  Chancellor Strong obviously reacted with a certain amount of strong feeling to having Dr. Kerr move in, as it were, on the local FSM problem.

Wellman:  Not at first, as far as I know. But, as time went on, considerable tension between them developed based in part, I suspect, because of lack of continuous communication which, in turn, resulted in misunderstandings. Both Kerr and Strong were trying very hard to find a solution or solutions to the problem. Kerr was willing to grant amnesty to the offenders, if that would help bring a solution. Strong, on the other hand, at least toward the end of his period as chancellor, felt strongly that the offenders should be punished and that that would help stop further offenses. I leaned toward Strong's position, but nobody asked me.

The differences between them came to a head, more or less, at a dinner meeting of the Regents in Los Angeles in December, 1964. At that meeting, Strong read a statement which by implication criticized Kerr and urged that prompt disciplinary action be taken. I felt that Strong made a mistake in openly challenging Kerr at that time. It didn't help matters.

Chall:  Was that the statement that appeared in the Oakland Tribune?

Wellman:  I believe it was. It is my understanding that Chancellor Strong sent a statement to the Oakland Tribune in confidence not expecting that it would be published.

Chall:  One of the problems to begin with, I guess, was that President Kerr and the Regents had, some time before 1964, authorized giving the twenty-six-foot strip on Bancroft Avenue to the city of Berkeley to be used as a "Hyde Park" area and that the process hadn't been completed.

Wellman:  Yes. It is my understanding that, on President Kerr's recommendation, the Regents had voted to give that strip to the city of Berkeley. I also understand that it was the responsibility of the secretary-treasurer of the Regents to carry out that authorization. I have never inquired of him why he didn't do so.
Chall: So that, in a sense, a tremendous upheaval came about in the University because of failure of a recommendation to be carried out.

Wellman: I don't know how much influence the failure to transfer that strip to the city had upon subsequent events, but I doubt that it was a major factor. If the strip had been transferred to the city and made available as a "Hyde Park" area, the FSM might have been delayed for a few weeks or possibly a few months; but I strongly suspect that it would eventually have hit Berkeley. It grew out of the "spirit of the times." It became nationwide and even worldwide.

Mrs. Wellman and I, in company with Chancellor Cheadle, left Paris, France for Göttingen, Germany to visit the University Overseas Center there the morning that the violent student revolt in Paris erupted (May, 1968).

The faculty of the Berkeley campus could, I think, have kept the FSM from becoming violent. But, the leaders of the Faculty Committee of Two Hundred, instead of condemning disruption of campus activities and outright vandalism, seemed to condone them and even to justify them as a means of accomplishing the ends which they felt to be desirable. In a very real sense, they were indirectly responsible for the turmoil and property damage, both on and off campus, and the resultant disillusionment of the general public with the University administration, faculty, and students alike. It could also be said, with some justification, that they contributed significantly to the election of Ronald Reagan as Governor of California; not necessarily, of course, by voting or campaigning for him, but by giving him a campaign issue "cleaning up the mess at Berkeley" which had widespread and popular appeal. They also helped to keep the faculty from getting salary range increases in both 1967-68 and 1968-69.

I suppose the blame for the turmoil and violence rests on the entire faculty, not just on the members of the Faculty Committee of Two Hundred.

Chall: Why do you say that?

Wellman: Because many of the faculty allowed themselves to be led by the Faculty Committee of Two Hundred while most of the others were indifferent to the happenings.
Wellman: The point I am trying to make is that the faculty themselves--and only the faculty--could have kept the FSM and its aftermath within due bounds; and, to have done so, the faculty would have had to speak with one voice--loudly and clearly. And I should, perhaps, add a cynical observation, namely, only the naive would have expected them to do so.

Free Speech Movement and Loyalty Oath Controversy Compared

Wellman: On an official visit to the Los Alamos Radiation Laboratory in New Mexico in the fall of 1964, shortly after the first sit-in on Sproul Plaza, Regent Catherine Hearst expressed the opinion that the free speech movement would turn out to be much more disruptive to the University than the loyalty oath controversy had been. I assured her that that would not happen. How wrong I was, and how right she was!

Sproul was tarnished by the loyalty oath controversy but that was mainly within the Regents. The faculty, for the most part, continued to support him especially after he shifted his position from for the loyalty oath to against the loyalty oath. He also retained the support of many influential people throughout the state during that time.

On the other hand, during the free speech movement, Kerr lost the support of the majority of the Berkeley campus faculty and also the support of many of the state's leaders in business, industry, and the professions.

The only posture by the president of the University that would have appeased many of the people of the state was that adopted by S.I. Hayakawa when he was president of San Francisco State College. He became a hero to many people by tearing out the wires on a sound truck, calling in the police, and talking tough. But he did not thereby prevent continued turmoil in his campus. At times it seemed that the turmoil at San Francisco State was even greater than at Berkeley.

I have often wondered how Kerr and Sproul would have been evaluated if their times as president of the University had been reversed--if Kerr had been president during the loyalty oath controversy and Sproul had been president during the free
speech movement. My guess is—and this is purely a guess—that Sproul's actions, had he been confronted with the free speech movement, would have been closer to Kerr's than to Hayakawa's. But I am also inclined to believe that Sproul, had he done exactly as Kerr did, would have retained wider support, not among the Regents, but among the general public.

Sproul had made hundreds of personal friends throughout the state during his presidency. Kerr had made relatively few. Before the free speech movement, Kerr had gained many admirers by his performance as chancellor of the Berkeley campus and as president of the University; but he hadn't acquired many close personal friends throughout the state. Hence, when his performance as president no longer seemed admirable to the general public, he had few close personal friends to speak up in his behalf.

Kerr was, in my judgment, a victim of circumstances not of his own making and which he could have done little to prevent or correct. I realize that some more knowledgeable than I am may disagree. But that is my considered judgment, more so now than during the free speech movement.

Kerr no doubt made mistakes in his handling of the free speech movement. Who didn't? Some of his actions, which now may appear to have been mistakes, were not so clear at the time. For example, some now say that as president he should not have become involved; but I, for one, doubt that at the time the Regents would have permitted him to keep hands off and allow the Berkeley campus administration to assume complete responsibility. Another way would have been for Kerr, himself, to have taken complete command and to have relieved the Berkeley campus administration of any responsibility. That approach might have been better than the divided and not always well-coordinated responsibility that prevailed. But it seems doubtful in retrospect that the turmoil that plagued the Berkeley campus would have been much abated had Kerr either kept hands off entirely or assumed complete command.
VI THE CHANCELLORS AND THE CAMPUSES

Chall: I would like now to consider the chancellors: how they were appointed; how you got along with them and they with you; and the special problems they encountered as you saw them.

Wellman: All right.

At the outset let me say that I think the University had outstanding chancellors during the time I was vice-president of the University. I doubt that you could find heads of nine public universities in any one section of the United States that were, on the average, as good. From 1952 until I retired in 1968, I attended the annual meetings of the Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, and I became quite well acquainted with many of the heads of the institutions who were members of that association. Only a relatively few of them would compare favorably with the chancellors of the University of California campuses.

Chall: Would you comment about them and the campuses they administered?

Wellman: We might take them up in order of the names of the campuses.

Chancellor Heyns and the Berkeley Campus

Wellman: Roger Heyns, at Berkeley, was a latecomer among the chancellors. He took office October 1, 1965. He was appointed by the Regents on the recommendation of President Kerr and a special committee of the Berkeley faculty and a special committee of the Regents. The two special committees had met jointly on several occasions. It was, as far as I am aware, the first time that a special committee of the Regents had been created to consider the appointment
of a chancellor. Whether there was also a committee of the Berkeley campus alumni, I am not sure; but I would be surprised if prominent alumni were not consulted.

I was the messenger that notified Roger Heyns and his wife Esther, who had come to Berkeley to meet with the Regents and the faculty, that the Regents had voted unanimously to offer him the appointment of chancellor of the Berkeley campus. That was at the July meeting of the Regents held in University Hall. At the time, Roger and Esther were in the University House on the campus.

Kerr asked me to urge Heyns to accept the appointment that day. I did, but Heyns quite properly said that he could not give an answer until after he had returned to Ann Arbor and talked with his colleagues in the University of Michigan, including its president. He was kind enough to tell me after he arrived back at Berkeley that my friendly and cordial attitude in talking with him was influential in persuading him to accept.

Heyns stepped into as tough a situation at Berkeley as I can imagine prevailing on any campus in any part of the United States. Turmoil on the Berkeley campus was increasing; violence and vandalism by students and nonstudents were becoming common place. Heyns treded his way through the seemingly insurmountable difficulties with great skill and patience, and he kept "his cool" despite sharp criticisms from both the left and the right. I believe that he contributed significantly to the peace which eventually came to the Berkeley campus.

Chall: How about the "People's Park"? Wasn't he chancellor at the time, and didn't he have some responsibility for the troubles that developed?

Wellman: Yes, he was chancellor at the time, and I suppose that it is fair to say that he had some responsibility for what occurred, at least indirectly. Although I had retired before the violence started, I, too, shared an indirect responsibility for it.

Chall: I did not know that. How were you involved?

Wellman: When I was acting president, I recommended to the Regents that the land be acquired by the University, that it be purchased with University funds rather than waiting for a state appropriation and that the houses be torn down. Heyns strongly supported
Wellman: that position. In the Berkeley Campus Development Plan, the area had been designated for student housing. Heyns proposed that it be used for intramural athletics and outdoor recreation for students pending the time that the student housing would be built. The Regents approved an appropriation of $1,300,000 of University funds to acquire the property.

The main reason for urging immediate action was that the area had become a ghetto and was housing many nonstudents. At a meeting of the Regents' Committee on Grounds and Buildings, William Beall--then chief of police of Berkeley--stated that the area had the highest crime rate of any area in Berkeley, and at times as many as thirty to forty people would be crowded into a house that normally accommodated six to eight people.

The property was acquired and the structures demolished by the fall of 1968. Why the land was not put immediately into playing fields I don't know; I had retired by that time. I suspect that the campus Office of Architects and Engineers wanted to do a better job than could be done with the funds then available.

Chancellor Mrak and the Davis Campus

Wellman: I have already reported on the appointment of Stanley Freeborn as the first provost of the Davis campus. He became provost in July, 1952. In 1958 his title was changed from provost to chancellor in recognition of the decision of the Regents on the recommendation of President Kerr to change the character of the Davis campus from a specialized campus to a general campus.

Emil Mrak was appointed by the Regents on the recommendation of Kerr to succeed Freeborn as chancellor of the Davis campus. Mrak took office July 1, 1959, and served as chancellor until July 1, 1969. At the time he retired, he was the senior chancellor in terms of years of service; also, up to that time he had served longer as chancellor of a University of California campus than any other person.

Mrak was appointed chancellor through the normal process--namely, recommended by a special faculty committee that had been nominated by the Academic Senate Committee on Committees, recommended by the president of the University, and approved by the Board of Regents.
Wellman: Mrak had not, I think, met all of the Regents before they approved his appointment. Afterwards, several of them told me that, in voting to approve Mrak, they thought they were voting to approve another person who had the day before talked at one of the Regents committee meetings and had made a very favorable impression.

Chall: Did Dr. Mrak know that?

Wellman: I don't think so, but he will if he reads this.

Thereafter, the Regents insisted on meeting the candidates who were to be recommended for a major administrative position prior to voting on them.

In order to impress the Regents with the high regard in which Mrak was held by the canning industry of the state, I suggested to the directors of the Canners' League of California that they give a dinner in Mrak's honor on the occasion of his inauguration. This they were delighted to do.

I had worked rather closely with the leaders of the canning industry for many years going back as far as 1926 when I made my first study on the economics of a canning crop, namely, peaches. Sometime in the 1940s, Jessie Tapp, a vice-president of the Bank of America and later chairman of the board of the bank, and I were appointed consultants to the Canners' League—an honorary position without duties or stipends. But we regularly received invitations to attend the annual meetings of board of directors of the Canners' League, and we did. Thus, I maintained my contacts with the leaders of the California canning industry long after I had ceased to do any research relating to that industry.

Whether those Regents who attended the Canners' League dinner, given in honor of Mrak, were impressed by the high regard in which he was held by the leaders of that industry, I don't know. But I do know that before long most and perhaps all of the Regents were impressed with Mrak's performance as chancellor of the Davis campus, and their admiration for him both professionally and personally grew through the years.

I had met Emil Mrak while he was still in Berkeley before he transferred to Davis, but I did not become well acquainted with him at that time. Later on when I became vice-president—agricultural sciences and Mrak was chairman of the Davis-Berkeley
Wellman: Department of Food Technology, I came to know him better. He was certainly an outstanding chairman of the Department of Instruction and Research; he encouraged excellence in teaching undergraduates as well as graduate students. He stimulated his faculty in research, and he encouraged them to participate actively in University and public service. In all three of these areas, he led the way.

When Mrak became chancellor, his interests in students--undergraduate as well as graduate, his interest in research--both basic and applied, and his interest in University and public service all continued unabated.

He did not, of course, have time to do any formal teaching or participate directly in research. He did, however, meet with students frequently, and several times each month had students to his home for luncheon. He took the lead in getting additional physical facilities for students such as recreational facilities and residence halls.

The Davis campus had a long tradition among the faculty of interest in undergraduate students and excellence in undergraduate instruction. Mrak helped maintain that tradition as the campus changed from a small to a much larger one and from a specialized campus to a general campus. I suspect, although I cannot prove it, that the interest in undergraduate students and undergraduate instruction by both the campus administration and the faculty contributed significantly to the maintenance of peace on the campus during the years of turmoil on the Berkeley campus.

Mrak was a superb lobbyist among the state legislators for the University, in general, and for the Davis campus, in particular. He made many friends among them by being a friend. He invited them to dinner in small groups along with a few other people. Both he and his wife, Vera, are gourmet cooks, and being a guest at their home for dinner was an enjoyable experience. Mrak never sought their support on any matter while they were guests in his home. When he wanted their help, he called on them in their offices.

Mrak also invited the legislators to the Davis campus on important occasions such as Charter Day, Graduation Day, and Picnic Day. He paid special attention to them seeing that they were properly taken care of, and they appreciated it. He
Wellman: spent quite a bit of time with the legislators in one way or another. He worked hard at it. It may be said that, since the Davis campus is close to Sacramento, it was relatively easy for him to keep closely in touch with the state legislators. And that, of course, is true. Nevertheless, he went far beyond what Freeborn had done and what, I understand, his successor thus far has done.

Establishing the Schools of Law and Medicine

Wellman: Some time in 1963, Albert Rodda, state senator from Sacramento County, called on me and urged that the University establish a medical school on the Davis campus. I explained to him that it would be premature to start a medical school at Davis; that a new medical school had just been authorized for the San Diego campus; that expansion of the medical schools at both Los Angeles and San Francisco was being undertaken; and that we ought to develop more fully what we already had before starting another one.

In lieu of a medical school, I proposed to Senator Rodda that the University establish a law school at Davis. He said that he would support one. I thought that he had agreed to trade a medical school for a law school but that did not prove to be the case.

On President Kerr's recommendation, the Regents voted to establish a law school at Davis, and funds for hiring a dean and for planning were included in the University's 1964-65 budget request. Mrak moved promptly in appointing a dean of the school--Edward L. Barrett, Jr., professor of law on the Berkeley campus. Instruction, with an entering class of eighty, was started in 1966. Temporary buildings--"Mrak shacks"--were put up and, after the law school had moved into its permanent building, were used for the medical school.

Senator Rodda had not forgotten his request for a medical school at Davis. The legislature added to the University's 1964-65 budget request funds for planning a medical school there. In addition to Senator Rodda, Senators Miller and Teale were strong proponents.
Chall: Did Chancellor Mrak favor having a medical school? Did he lobby for it?

Wellman: I am sure he favored having the school, but he checked with President Kerr before indicating to his friends in the legislature (Miller, Rodda, Teale, and others) that he was "willing." I am also quite certain that, once the Regents had authorized the school, he lobbied for it in his own effective way.

Mrak got the medical school underway with extraordinary speed. Charles J. Tupper of the University of Michigan was appointed dean and took office in February 1966. He, like Mrak, was a "go-getter." They made a good team. Key faculty members were recruited; a curriculum was developed; planning for permanent facilities was begun; temporary facilities were provided; and the first class of forty-eight students was enrolled in the fall of 1968.

A few months after Tupper arrived, Mrak invited him and me to his house for lunch, and a very good lunch it was. Afterwards, he and Tupper explained that they needed space for faculty offices and research and that, if they got it immediately, they would guarantee to accept first-year medical students in the fall of 1968. It was then too late to get state funds for a building before 1967-68, and a building was absolutely necessary before students could be admitted. I said that, if a steel (prefab) building similar to those constructed on the Irvine campus would be satisfactory, I would recommend to President Kerr that University funds be provided. A one-story prefab building with 92,000 ASF [assignable square feet] was erected at a cost of $243,000, financed with University funds; and forty-eight first-year medical students were admitted in the fall of 1968.

Chancellor Aldrich and the Irvine Campus

Wellman: Daniel G. Aldrich, Jr., was appointed the first chancellor of the Irvine campus in January, 1962. He continued to serve as University dean of agriculture for some months until he took up residence in Newport Beach.

I have already mentioned that, while I was vice-president of agricultural sciences, I persuaded Aldrich to move from Riverside to Davis and accept the chairmanship of the Berkeley-
Wellman: Davis Department of Soils and Plant Nutrition. I have also mentioned that he succeeded me as head of the Division of Agricultural Sciences with a title of University dean of agricultural sciences.

My participation in the development of the Irvine campus was quite limited other than with respect to my normal responsibilities; namely, review of the annual operating budget requests, review of capital outlay requests, and review of the recommendations for appointment to tenure ranks. With regard to these matters, I had the same responsibilities for the new campuses that I had for the older campuses.

Before the Regents had decided on a site for the proposed campus in southeast Los Angeles County--Orange County--I attended a large mass meeting sponsored by the Newport Harbor Chamber of Commerce to demonstrate community support for the establishment of a University campus on land then owned by the Irvine Land Company. Two prominent Berkeley campus alumni living in the area--Walter Burroughs and Edward J. "Brick" Powers--took an active part in promoting the campus.

The mass meeting was attended by Joan Irvine Burt, granddaughter of the founder of the Irvine Land Company and the daughter of its late president. She spoke in favor of the Irvine Land Company giving 1,000 acres near Newport Beach to the University for a general campus. She was a large stockholder of the Irvine Land Company and a member of its board of directors. She stated that she was speaking for herself personally, not for the board of directors of the Irvine Company. I was told that she vigorously supported the gift at the meetings of the directors.

I was also told that the current earnings of the Irvine Land Company were small (most of the land was still dry grassland) and did not provide her with sufficient funds to meet her wants. She felt that a general campus of the University of California would stimulate development of the rangeland and, hence, the earnings of the company. In that, she was right.

Joan Irvine Burt was, at that time, a statuesque blond--very good looking. A newspaper photographer took my picture with her. I am sorry that I didn't get a copy of that picture. A print in the newspaper of which I do have a copy doesn't do her justice.
I also spoke at the mass meeting expressing the interest of the University in having a general campus in the area.

Establishing the School of Medicine

My most important special relationship to the Irvine campus was in negotiating the transfer of the California College of Medicine to the University and its subsequent location on the Irvine campus.

The California College of Medicine was a private medical school located on about seven acres of land adjacent to the Los Angeles County Hospital. It had use of one wing of that hospital. It had been started as an osteopathic school. It was in financial difficulty.

In 1964 the state legislature passed a joint resolution requesting the University to take over the school. We were most reluctant to do so, but saw no other choice. The Master Plan for Higher Education had given the University exclusive jurisdiction among the public institutions over training in medicine (also over training in dentistry, law, veterinary medicine, and graduate architecture). One or more of the state colleges, we were told, would gladly have taken over the California College of Medicine. That, of course, we could not allow. Also, we were opposed to having the state provide funds directly to a private college or university. For these two reasons, we felt that the University should comply with the request of the state legislature.

Moreover, one of the powerful senators in the state legislature, Stephen Teale, was a graduate of the California College of Medicine and believed that it must be preserved since it was adding significantly to the short supply of doctors in the state. He was the only member of the state legislature at that time who had been trained as a doctor and, consequently, was looked up to by his fellow legislators as an expert in the field of medicine.

I attended quite a few meetings in Los Angeles with the trustees of the California College of Medicine in company with Clinton C. Powell, M.D., who was special assistant to me in
Wellman: health affairs. He was very knowledgeable and most helpful, not only in connection with the California College of Medicine but also in connection with the development of the medical schools at San Diego and Davis.

After considerable discussion extending over many months, we were finally able to work out an agreement that was mutually satisfactory to the trustees of the California College of Medicine and to the Regents of the University for transfer of the college to the University.

During that time, we were also considering how best we could develop that college as an acceptable school of medicine in the University. It seemed clear that a new site would have to be found. The existing site--next to the Los Angeles County Hospital--was altogether too small, containing only seven acres. Moreover, the wing of the County Hospital, over which the California College of Medicine had professional control, was entirely inadequate. The remainder of the hospital was under the professional control of the School of Medicine of the University of Southern California. That school had a good reputation, and it could easily assume professional control of the wing assigned to the California College of Medicine.

We employed a man by the name of Mark Blumberg, an M.D., who had had some experience with medical schools to search for an affiliation of the California College of Medicine with an existing hospital or hospitals in the Los Angeles area. Among the possibilities, and none of them was very good, we gave consideration to moving the college to the San Fernando Valley adjacent to a new Veterans Administration Hospital. It is a good thing we didn't; that hospital was almost completely destroyed by the 1971 earthquake.

We also felt that it was undesirable to have a free-standing medical school; that is, one not located on or close to a major campus and under the jurisdiction of that campus. We did not want to administer a medical school directly from University Hall.

I had what I thought was a good idea, and I still do; namely, that the California College of Medicine be transferred to the Davis campus. I called on Senator Teale in Sacramento and suggested the idea to him. He said no; while he wanted us to go ahead with a medical school at Davis, he felt strongly that the University should have three medical schools in Southern California.
Wellman: The potential campuses to which to transfer the California College of Medicine were Irvine and Riverside. Irvine seemed to be the better choice of the two. The population of Orange County was larger and was growing more rapidly; hence, clinical cases would be more abundant. Also, the campus area was large--1,000 acres--and a medical complex could easily be located within the campus without, in any way, interfering with the other University activities planned for it. There was much more unassigned land on the Irvine campus than on the Riverside campus.

Aldrich was willing to accept the California College of Medicine and persuaded his faculty to go along with it. We assured him that we would do our best to obtain the necessary funds to upgrade the California College of Medicine which was very much in need of upgrading.

Chall: How did you feel about the way the Irvine campus was to be developed as compared with the San Diego and Santa Cruz campuses?

Wellman: I preferred the Irvine plan; development from a central core with the traditional type of colleges and departments and starting with both undergraduate students and graduate students. Also, I favored admitting junior college graduates as well as high school graduates. It seemed to me that the Irvine plan made it somewhat easier to crowd students and faculty into existing facilities until additional space became available than either the San Diego or the Santa Cruz plans. That proved to be the case during the time I was still active in the University; whether it continued to be so, I do not know.

Chall: You haven't said anything yet about Dr. Aldrich's performance as chancellor. What was your opinion?

Wellman: I thought Aldrich made an excellent chancellor for the Irvine campus--just right for developing a campus of that sort. He had ability, energy, and enthusiasm; and it took all three, in large amounts, to accomplish what he accomplished in such a short time. The campus opened its doors in the fall of 1965 with an enrollment of almost 1,600 students--nearly 1,450 undergraduate students and 140 graduate students. Of the undergraduate students, 1,175 were in the lower division and 275 in the upper division. Three years later, in the fall of 1968 just after I retired, enrollment in the general campus totaled 3,548--2,960 undergraduate students and 588 graduate students. In addition, the California College of Medicine had an enrollment that fall of 575 students.
Wellman: When Dan Aldrich was University dean of agriculture, he was asked at a board meeting why a major in home economics was justified in the University. He gave an eloquent and somewhat emotional reply in which he mentioned the value of training for a future homemaker, a wife, and a mother. When he had finished, Jack Oswald, at that time vice-president--executive assistant, commented in a stage whisper which could be heard throughout the room, "I nominate Dan as Mother of the Year."

Chancellor Murphy and the Los Angeles Campus

Wellman: Franklin D. Murphy became chancellor of the Los Angeles campus on July 1, 1960. He succeeded Vern O. Knudsen who had been chancellor for the one year, 1959-60. Knudsen was appointed chancellor when Raymond B. Allen resigned to become the head of the AID mission in Indonesia.

Raymond B. Allen was the first chancellor of UCLA, having been appointed in 1952—the same time that Kerr was appointed chancellor of the Berkeley campus.

As far as I know, Murphy's appointment as chancellor of UCLA followed the normal procedure; that is, recommendation by a special committee of the faculty appointed by the Academic Senate Committee on Committees, recommendation by the president, and appointment by the Board of Regents. Before his appointment by the board, Murphy visited the Los Angeles campus and met members of the faculty, some Regents, and some prominent members of the UCLA Alumni Association. I took him around the campus one day—President Kerr was unable to do so—and explained to him the best I could the setup and operations of the Academic Senate and its committees.

Murphy was, I think, the ideal chancellor for UCLA at the time. He was persuasive and aggressive in improving the academic status of UCLA and its position in the community, the state and the nation. Under him, the campus grew substantially in distinction and size.

Murphy was not happy with the authority of the president's office or of the Academic Senate.
Wellman: Shortly after he was appointed, the Regents Committee on Educational Policy of the Academic Senate held a joint meeting in Los Angeles. During the discussion after dinner, Chancellor Murphy made one of his persuasive speeches in which I thought he was announcing his intention to have UCLA secede from the University. I decided to answer him. I may have been more vigorous than usual. I had gone without luncheon that day, and the two cocktails I had before dinner were on an empty stomach. After the meeting was over, two Regents chided me for speaking out of turn; several others congratulated me for saying what needed to be said.

Franklin and I soon became good friends and have remained so. I admired him professionally and became fond of him personally.

I found it relatively easy to work with Murphy. He knew what he wanted; he did his homework and presented well-documented proposals. He accepted with good grace the reductions that we in the University-wide administration felt we had to make in both his operating budget request and his capital outlay request, but we had to have adequate justification for doing so.

It seemed to me that Murphy was particularly astute in sizing up the overall situation concerning higher education in California and in the state and nation. For example, when matching federal funds became available for construction of dental schools, Murphy immediately proposed that the priority for the UCLA dental school be raised and at the same time agreed to a reduction in state funds in an equal amount on projects that had been higher in the list. As a result, a building for the dental school on UCLA campus was built rather promptly. On the other hand, a building for the dental school on the San Francisco campus--the need for which had long been recognized--has not yet been built. I shall have more to say about that when we come to San Francisco.

It should be said that William G. Young, vice-chancellor under Murphy with responsibility for the campus building program, was an extremely effective person. He acquired a detailed knowledge of the numerous building projects, knew what needed to be done, and was able to reconcile the differences within the campus.
Wellman: Murphy never, I think, became convinced that the Academic Senate Committees should have as much authority and influence as they did. But since he could not get rid of them or, I should say, reduce their influence under the University of California system, he learned how best to work with them.

It should be said with some accuracy that Chancellor Murphy was partly responsible for the difficulty that the University encountered under Governor Reagan. Some of Governor Reagan's powerful supporters were trustees of the University of Southern California. At one time, USC was the major university in Southern California. It would, I think, have been rated fair to good in overall academic status. It had winning athletic teams, and it attracted substantial gifts from wealthy people in Los Angeles, Hollywood, and Beverly Hills.

UCLA had, of course, been growing in size and prestige from the time it moved to the Westwood campus. Progress was rapid after World War II, but it didn't seem to pose much of a threat to USC until after Murphy became chancellor; at least I never heard of any comments to that effect. Under Murphy, the campus became much better known to the general public in Southern California. UCLA developed winning athletic teams that, on occasion, won from USC in football and track and consistently in basketball.

But perhaps even more important in causing concern to the USC administration and trustees was Murphy's success in obtaining substantial gifts from wealthy people in the Los Angeles area. Prior to Murphy's time, Beverly Hills and Hollywood had been the exclusive domain of the private colleges and universities as far as giving was concerned. The California Institute of Technology did not, I think, feel the competition from UCLA that USC did. Cal Tech occupied a unique position of its own--small and prestigious; moreover, it was receiving large amounts of federal funds.

When President Dwight Eisenhower spoke on the UCLA campus (Charter Day, 1963), the academic procession was headed by a triumvir: President Kerr on the left, Chancellor Murphy on the right, and President Eisenhower in the middle. That was the first and, as far as I know, the last time that a chancellor of a UC campus assumed that his rank was equal to that of the president of the University.
Herman T. Spieth was appointed provost of the Riverside campus, effective July 1, 1956, succeeding Gordon S. Watkins—the first provost of that campus. At that time, Spieth reported to President Sproul through me as had his predecessor.

Spieth was appointed provost without the benefit of a faculty committee's recommendation.

A faculty committee to advise on the appointment of a provost to succeed Watkins had been nominated by the Riverside Academic Senate Committee on Committees and appointed by me. That committee submitted only one name. Both Watkins and I felt that the list should contain the names of more than one person qualified for the position. Although requested to do so, the committee refused to add any names. It soon became known around the campus that the committee had recommended only one person and who that person was. He was not acceptable to the leading scientists in the Citrus Experiment Station which at that time had more faculty members than the College of Letters and Science.

I was informed of the dissatisfaction of the Citrus Experiment Station faculty by Sidney H. Cameron, professor of subtropical horticulture on the UCLA campus. He also told me that the Citrus Experiment Station faculty thought that Herman T. Spieth, chairman of the Division of Life Sciences in the College of Letters and Science, Riverside campus, would make an excellent provost of the campus. I talked the matter over with Watkins. We interviewed separately the leading faculty members in the Citrus Experiment Station and found that they strongly favored Spieth. We also found that the majority of the faculty members in both the Division of Life Sciences and the Division of Physical Sciences favored the appointment of Spieth.

Spieth was one of the small cadre of scholars recruited by Watkins to help develop the new College of Letters and Science. Watkins had a first-hand knowledge of Spieth's qualifications, having worked with him closely for several years. He convinced me that Spieth would be an excellent choice.

Watkins and I wrote a joint letter to President Sproul recommending that Spieth be appointed provost of the Riverside campus. Sproul accepted our recommendation and so recommended to the Regents.
At the time Spieth became provost, the campus was still being developed as the "Swarthmore of the West"—a small undergraduate liberal arts campus of the highest quality with a maximum enrollment of 1,500 students. That was the original concept of the campus as far as instruction was concerned, a concept formulated by Watkins and approved by the Regents. The initial faculty was recruited on that basis. The students who enrolled at Riverside in the early years went there largely because of the unique character of the institution. The college became a success almost overnight and was highly regarded academically. It was accredited by the Western College Association two years after the first students were admitted, and chapters of both Sigma Xi and Phi Beta Kappa were soon authorized.

During his eight-year career as chief campus officer of the Riverside campus, Spieth encountered numerous problems. What chief campus officer didn't! I'll mention a few of Spieth's problems as I saw them. In the first place, he succeeded Gordon Watkins, and Watkins was not an easy man to have to follow. Watkins was an eloquent speaker and a persuasive proponent of the small liberal arts college. He charmed the people of Riverside and the surrounding communities. He could, I was told by several knowledgeable people, easily have been elected mayor of the city of Riverside.

In the second place—and this was a far greater problem—Spieth had, two years after he became provost, to lead the campus in a new direction—away from a small liberal arts campus, which was dear to the hearts of both faculty and students, and toward a potentially large university campus.

In the fall of 1958, the Regents, on the recommendation of President Kerr, designated the Riverside campus along with the Davis campus and the Santa Barbara campus as general university campuses. The title of Spieth and of Freeborn at Davis was changed from provost to chancellor. The title of the chief campus officer of the Santa Barbara campus was not changed at that time since the person holding that position was serving in an acting capacity; however, it was changed the following July 1, with the appointment of Samuel B. Gould.

The drastic change in the mission of the Riverside campus had, of course, been discussed with Spieth before it was announced. My impression at the time was, and still is, that Spieth was not personally opposed to the change and perhaps was
Wellman: even favorably inclined to it. That was also, I think, the position of many of the faculty members in the Divisions of Life Sciences and Physical Sciences. On the other hand, most, if not all, of the faculty members in the humanities and the social sciences deeply regretted the change in direction; some of them never became reconciled to it.

Spieth, himself, recognized that the University would have to be greatly expanded in order to take care of the respective increase in the number of students and that the Riverside campus should carry its share of the load. He turned his energy and ability to accomplishing that task and, by 1964 when he resigned as chancellor, had virtually completed the changeover. And, in accomplishing that difficult task, he had retained the respect and admiration of students, faculty, and townspeople alike.

The year before Spieth became the chief campus officer of the Riverside campus (1955-56) enrollment totaled 760 students—752 undergraduate students and 8 graduate students. I don't know why the 8 graduate students. In his last year as chancellor, total enrollment amounted to 2,554 students—2,003 undergraduate students and 551 graduate students. In that year 22 percent of the students enrolled were graduate students.

Enrollment continued to climb under Ivan Hinderaker's administration. He succeeded Spieth as chancellor July 1, 1964. By 1968-69, total enrollment came to 4,446 students—3,314 undergraduate students and 1,132 graduate students. The proportion of graduate students that year was 25.5 percent.

During the years he was chancellor, Dr. Spieth kept up with his professional field, zoology, by wide reading and attendance at professional meetings. Hence, when he resigned as chancellor, he was able to return to teaching and research in zoology without too much loss of time.

Chancellor Mrak persuaded Spieth to transfer to the Davis campus and become chairman of the Department of Zoology there. Spieth not only strengthened materially the Department of Zoology at Davis through his effective administration of it, but he also strengthened the Davis campus generally through his wise counsel in academic and administrative matters. He also became one of the campus's distinguished scientists.
Chancellor Galbraith and the San Diego Campus

Wellman: John S. Galbraith became chancellor of the San Diego campus in January, 1965. He was faced with the task of persuading a reluctant faculty to expand substantially undergraduate offerings not only in humanities and social sciences but also in physical and biological sciences. He was well aware of the problem when he took office and was determined to do something about it. He and I had discussed it on more than one occasion during the six months he was vice-chancellor of San Diego before becoming chancellor and, of course, quite often thereafter.

The campus opened its doors to undergraduate students for the first time in September, 1964. Only 180 freshmen enrolled; no junior college transfers were admitted on the grounds that they had not had the courses to be required by the campus of its lower division students.

The initial undergraduate curriculum of the campus was rigidly prescribed: no electives for lower division students and few for upper division students--and science and mathematics predominated. It seemed to me that the faculty was interested only in training undergraduate students to become graduate students and required them to take the courses that they would have liked their graduate students to have taken.

Galbraith was able to persuade the faculty of Revelle College (the name of the first college of the San Diego campus was changed to Revelle College at the time Galbraith became chancellor) to modify to some extent the rigid undergraduate curriculum they had originally adopted; consequently, enrollment of undergraduate students increased. He was more influential with the faculty in academic matters than his predecessor, Herbert F. York, had been. Galbraith was an eminent scholar himself and had had long experience in teaching both undergraduate and graduate students. York, on the other hand, had done little research and teaching.

Another of Galbraith's important contributions to the development of the San Diego campus was the proposal to renovate the buildings left at Camp Matthews by the marines for University use as classrooms, teaching laboratories, and faculty offices. This project was carried out under his general direction financed by an appropriation of $1 million from the state. The second
Wellman: college, named the John Muir College after the famous California naturalist, was started at Camp Matthews and thereby accepted students several years in advance of the time the college's permanent buildings were to become available.

Background of the San Diego Campus

Chall: Why was the faculty reluctant to expand substantially its undergraduate offerings to meet the needs of the large number of high school and junior college graduates in the San Diego area?

Wellman: The answer is, I think, that the faculty of the School of Science and Engineering which later became Revelle College was recruited largely, if not entirely, on the basis of their interest in research, post-doctoral training, and graduate instruction. Some of them, I was told, were assured that they would not have to participate in undergraduate teaching despite the fact that such assurance was contrary to Regents' policy.

A bit of history might not be out of place here, even though there may be some repetition to what I have already mentioned.

Based on the Regents' 1956 authorization to expand over a period of years the faculty and facilities of the La Jolla campus to provide a graduate program in sciences and technology, the city of San Diego had offered the University a gift of about sixty acres of land adjoining the La Jolla campus as a site for the new program, and the General Dynamics Corporation had offered the University a gift of $1 million to be used to employ faculty for the new program. The Regents did not accept the offer of land until 1959; they accepted promptly the money gift. Roger Revelle, director of the Scripps Institution of Oceanography, started immediately thereafter to recruit faculty members for the graduate program in sciences and technology.

It is my understanding that Revelle originated the idea of a graduate program in sciences and technology for the La Jolla campus; that he sold the idea to the civic leaders of San Diego, and that he promoted both the gift of sixty acres of land for the permanent site of the program and a gift of the million dollars to get it started immediately. He was a persuasive person. He could, I think, appropriately be called the "Father" of that program.
Wellman: My first involvement with the program, as I mentioned earlier, was as chairman of a special committee appointed by President Sproul in 1957. That committee recommended not only that a general University campus be located in the San Diego area but also that the Regents reaffirm their previous action authorizing the expansion of La Jolla campus to provide a graduate program in sciences and technology.

My next involvement with the La Jolla campus was at a meeting with a committee of the Regents the evening before I was appointed vice-president of the University. I made a suggestion that was adopted by the committee and on the following day by the Board, namely that the faculty of the Institute of Technology and Engineering (the name was later changed to the School of Science and Engineering) should be told that they would be expected to carry a full teaching load and teach undergraduate students as well as graduate students when they became part of the general campus. I am inclined to doubt that many of them were so informed, or if they were, they did not take it seriously.

Roger Revelle was appointed dean of the School of Science and Engineering in addition to his appointment as director of the Scripps Institution of Oceanography. In 1959 the Regents accepted a gift of 450 acres from the city of San Diego and a gift of 500 acres (Camp Matthews a World War II U.S. Marine Corps installation) from the federal government as a site for the general campus. Revelle served as chief campus officer until February, 1961, when Herbert F. York became chancellor.

Establishing the School of Medicine

Wellman: The segment of the San Diego campus on which I probably spent more time than on any other was the medical school.

On the basis of a comprehensive report by the University administration and urging by the state legislature and the governor, the Regents approved the establishment of a medical school at San Diego in February, 1962. We in the University-wide administration wanted a well-balanced program of teaching and research, not overweighted by either, and I think that also was the intention of the Regents. However, influential faculty members on the San Diego campus wanted to create a medical school
Wellman: with the same strong research orientation as was being developed in other areas of the campus. Training of medical scientists rather than of practicing physicians was their primary aim.

The person who exercised the most influence on planning the academic program of the Medical School was Professor David M. Bonner, chairman of the Department of Biology, and a world famous biochemical geneticist. He had firm convictions on the type of medical education that should be offered at San Diego, and he was very persuasive in presenting it. The dean of the Medical School, Joseph Stokes III, and the initial faculty of the school concurred with Bonner. Chancellor York apparently also concurred with Bonner, although at the meeting of the Regents at which the establishment of a medical school at San Diego was approved, Chancellor York stated that the major emphasis of the school would be the training of practicing physicians, not of medical scientists.

The overemphasis on research led to an extreme request for capital outlay funds, that is, extremely large in Kerr's opinion and mine. As I recall, the total sum requested by the campus for buildings for the medical school came to $120 million. I could not justify anywhere near that amount. Kerr agreed with me.

Chancellor Galbraith supported the Medical School's request of around $120 million in capital outlay funds. This was the main disagreement, other than the extent of decentralization, which Galbraith and I had. I made several trips to San Diego to listen to the campus' presentation. They did not convince me.

In mid-February, 1966, John S. Galbraith and Robert H. Biron submitted their resignations as chancellor and vice-chancellor--business and finance, respectively, of the San Diego campus. Their resignations were entirely unexpected by President Kerr and me.

Galbraith and Murphy had been the chief proponents among the chancellors of virtually complete decentralization of the campuses. Kerr had already gone as far in that direction as I thought any reasonable person could expect him to and farther than I thought desirable. Yet, here were the two top administrators of the campus submitting their resignations over what they claimed to be lack of adequate consideration of the campus viewpoints by University-wide administration. Plans for the San Diego medical school were cited as a case in point.
Wellman: I have already mentioned the large amount of time which I had spent in connection with the development of the San Diego medical school. Although Galbraith and I disagreed on the amount of capital outlay funds needed for the Medical School, I thought that I had a good working relation with him and that there was no lack of good communication between us.

Just before the March meeting of the Regents (1966), Galbraith and Biron withdrew their resignations. Both Kerr and I had urged them to do so. Also, they were urged to do so by the faculty of the campus and by certain leaders of the community. The continued progress of the campus would have slowed down at that time had it been necessary to find new leadership.

Sometime later Galbraith told me that he regretted having submitted his resignation. I suspect that he was influenced to do so by Biron, although I have no direct evidence in support of that suspicion.

In 1968 Galbraith resigned as chancellor of the San Diego campus to accept the Smuts Visiting Fellowship at Cambridge University, England, a prestigious position. Upon completing that assignment, he returned to his former position as professor of history at the University of California, Los Angeles.

Galbraith served three years and nine months as chancellor of the San Diego campus. During that short period, he was instrumental in turning the campus into a general University campus with emphasis on undergraduate instruction as well as on graduate instruction. I did not personally feel that in doing so he detracted from the eminence of the campus; I know that through his efforts the campus became more useful to many of the state's youths, especially in the San Diego area.

Herbert F. York, the first chancellor of the San Diego campus, was named acting chancellor following Galbraith's resignation and served in that capacity until the appointment of William J. McGill as chancellor August 1, 1968.

I met with the faculty committee appointed by President Hitch to advise on the replacement of Galbraith. At that time,
Wellman: the faculty committee wanted to restrict its recommendation to one person. President Hitch refused to accept a "one person only" recommendation. At the same time, he refused to recommend to the Regents the appointment of a person not recommended by the faculty committee. For awhile there was a stalemate. Later the faculty committee relented and added the name of William J. McGill. Incidentally, McGill was the chairman of the faculty committee. In that capacity, he had apparently impressed the other members most favorably. He was unanimously recommended by the other members of the committee without his knowledge.

Chancellor Saunders and the San Francisco Campus

Wellman: John B. de C.M. Saunders was appointed provost of the San Francisco campus in September, 1958. On July 1, 1964, his title was changed from provost to chancellor. From 1956 to 1958, he served as chairman of an administrative advisory committee which supervised the administration of the campus, and, as such, he was in effect the chief campus officer of the San Francisco campus.

I became acquainted with Saunders at the meetings of President Sproul's administrative staff. They were attended by the vice-presidents and chief campus officers and were usually held Saturday mornings following the Regents' meetings. The only official responsibilities for the San Francisco campus which I had at that time was as chairman and member of the State-wide Coordinating Committee for Buildings and Campus Development.

After I became vice-president of the University, I had a good deal to do with the San Francisco campus (operating budgets and capital outlay budgets; academic appointments, promotions, and salary increases).

Chall: Were you involved in Dr. Saunders's resignation as chancellor?

Wellman: Yes, rather deeply involved.

Chall: Why did he resign?

Wellman: President Kerr asked him to resign, and that request was approved by a majority of the Regents. His resignation was effective July 1, 1966.
The issue was over the academic development of the San Francisco campus.

About a dozen of the most eminent faculty members in the School of Medicine requested a conference with President Kerr who asked me to attend in his place and I did. Those faculty members were unanimously of the opinion that the San Francisco medical school was lagging behind the top medical schools in the United States in both the quality and quantity of research being done. That was apparently true. The San Francisco medical school did not rank among the top ten medical schools in the country and possibly not even among the top twenty. As a result of being on the board of directors of the Rockefeller Foundation, Kerr was quite familiar with the ranking of medical schools. He felt, and I agreed with him, that the standing of the San Francisco medical school could and should be improved; in particular, that more emphasis should be placed on research.

The situation at San Francisco was just the opposite to that of our Medical School in San Diego--where research was being emphasized at the detriment of teaching.

Kerr and I wanted a well-balanced program between teaching and research in all of the University's medical schools. There could, of course, be disagreement on just what constituted a well-balanced program. But, at least in my judgment, neither San Francisco nor San Diego had one; San Francisco was underbalanced in research, and San Diego was underbalanced in teaching.

I met with the group of faculty members on two different occasions and talked to a number of them individually. They charged that Chancellor Saunders was not supportive of research as evidenced by his recommendations for faculty appointments and promotions and by his allocations of space for research. They felt strongly that the San Francisco medical school would not become a distinguished medical school under Saunders's administration of the campus.

The leader of the faculty group opposed to Dr. Saunders's continuance as chancellor was Dr. Julius H. Comroe, Jr., director of the Cardiovascular Research Institute, and the most distinguished scientist in the San Francisco medical school.

My impression at the time was that quite a bit of personal animosity had developed between Comroe and Saunders over the amount and location of space which Saunders had allotted to the
In my experience space is a very sensitive area. It is something that University people seem to take personally—the size and location of their offices and laboratories and the amount and location of the space assigned to the units they administer.

Looking backward, I have the uneasy feeling that I did not handle the situation as well as I should have. I talked to Saunders several times about the need to strengthen research. On one occasion, with President Kerr’s specific concurrence, I suggested that he give up the position of chancellor of the San Francisco campus and accept a position as vice-president—medical and health sciences. He refused. I did not press him to reconsider; perhaps I should have. At the time I was on good terms with him and, if I had tried harder, I might have persuaded him to change positions or alternatively to strengthen substantially the research capability of the campus.

Chall: If Saunders had been willing to put more emphasis on research, he might have stayed as chancellor?

Wellman: Yes, if he had been more interested in attracting medical scientists and in providing facilities for them.

I might mention that controversy had plagued the San Francisco medical school before Saunders became chief campus officer. From 1940 to 1942, President Sproul, himself, served as dean of the San Francisco medical school and, according to Miss Agnes Robb, he had to spend six months in residence on the San Francisco campus in order to keep the school from erupting.

Saunders’s successor as chancellor was Willard C. Fleming, long-time dean of the School of Dentistry. Fleming was due to retire July 1, 1966, but agreed to serve as chancellor for the year 1966-67.

Fleming had a keen sense of humor as illustrated by the following incident: The Regents’ meeting on the Davis campus in the fall of 1966 had become very tense over two issues—the readmission of Mario Savio and the performances of the Mime Troupe.

As far as the Regents were concerned, Mario Savio was the chief villain of the Free Speech Movement and to readmit him as
Wellman: a student, even though he was qualified for readmission, was anathema to some of them.

The performances of the Mime Troupe were exceedingly vulgar and, in the opinion of some Regents, should be banned from the campuses. The discussion over both issues became heated. For a time it appeared that there might be a motion to censure Chancellor Heyns and President Kerr.

Fleming "saved the day." He rose to his feet and, after being recognized by the chairman of the board, said, "Yesterday, I gave permission to the Mime Troupe to perform on the San Francisco campus." Some of the Regents gasped.

Fleming continued, "That was the hardest decision that I've had to make since four student nurses appeared before me in a discipline case charged with slipping into the men's room and spreading honey on the toilet seats."

The tension was broken. The two issues were dropped and the meeting continued harmoniously.

Early Plans for the School of Dentistry

Wellman: Turning now to a different issue, the attempts at getting a dentistry building on the San Francisco campus illustrates the risks of delaying action until an ideal plan can be carried out. The consulting architect for the campus, with the able assistance of the University architect Robert Evans had prepared a physical development plan for the campus which had received the endorsement of Chancellor Saunders, President Kerr, and the Regents. That plan called for the location of the building to house the School of Dentistry on land which the University did not then own but which it hoped to acquire.

At that time funds for the building, including a substantial federal grant, seemed assured. However, the state refused to appropriate funds for purchase of the land on which the building was to be located; and the Regents, feeling that purchase of the land was a responsibility of the state, declined to use University funds for that purpose.
Wellman: On several occasions I talked to the University architect about relocating the dentistry building on land already within the campus boundaries. But he felt that to do so would be detrimental to the campus's development in the long run. At the time I retired, there was no change in the proposed location of the dentistry building nor was there any dentistry building underway.

Chancellor Cheadle and the Santa Barbara Campus

Wellman: Vernon I. Cheadle became chancellor of the Santa Barbara campus on July 1, 1962. His most important contribution as chancellor, while I was vice-president of the University, was in moving the campus from a college campus to a university campus. That was no small achievement, especially in view of the opposition of the old-time Santa Barbara faculty members.

At the time of his appointment as chancellor of the Santa Barbara campus, Cheadle was professor of botany on the Davis campus and was serving as vice-chancellor of that campus under Mrak. He had been recruited by Dean Hutchison to replace W.W. Robbins, who had been the long-time chairman of the Department of Botany on the Davis campus--one of the strong departments on that campus. It had achieved a national reputation in weed control.

I met Cheadle soon after I became vice-president--agricultural sciences, and I had an opportunity of observing his performance as teacher, researcher, and academic administrator. I was impressed on all three counts. Hence, when he was placed at the top of the list of candidates for the chancellorship of the Santa Barbara campus by a University-wide faculty committee, I had no difficulty whatsoever in supporting his appointment.

Kerr had become acquainted with Cheadle during the time he was vice-chancellor of the Davis campus and had seen him in action when he presented the first academic plan for the Davis campus at a meeting of the Regents. Some of the Regents felt that he was a bit flippant, others thought that he was excellent.

The State College at Santa Barbara was taken over by the Regents in 1944 and became a branch of the University. About the only thing that happened during the next fourteen years by
Wellman: the reason of that transfer was a change in name from the Santa Barbara State College to the Santa Barbara College of the University of California. In everything but name, the faculty remained a state college faculty, the students remained state college students, and the curriculum remained a state college curriculum. In looking back over the history of that period, it seems to me that the attitude of the University administration--including the Regents toward the Santa Barbara College--was one of benign neglect. I don't think the college was any worse off under University administration, but I doubt that it was any better off than if it had remained a state college.

Clark G. Kuebler, president of Ripon College, Wisconsin, and formerly professor of classics, became provost of Santa Barbara College in February, 1955. He was brought in to guide the development of the college as a liberal arts college. He resigned in November, 1955. From then until mid-1959, Elmer R. Noble served as acting provost. By that time the plan for Santa Barbara College envisioned a liberal arts college plus a strong emphasis on teacher training in home economics and industrial arts. The planned capacity was 3,500 students.

Shortly after Kerr became president of the University, he recommended to the Regents that the Santa Barbara campus, along with the Davis and Riverside campuses, be designated general campuses. The Regents approved his recommendation, and they also approved his recommendation that the planned capacity of the Santa Barbara campus be increased to 10,000 students.

Development Under Chancellor Gould

Wellman: Samuel B. Gould was recruited as chancellor to guide the Santa Barbara campus from a college campus to a university campus. Enrollment on the campus the year before he became chancellor was 2,900 students--1,500 women and 1,400 men. In his last year as chancellor, 1961-62, enrollment had climbed to 4,500 students--2,400 women and 2,100 men.

Chancellor Gould made a start toward changing the character of the campus. Under his administration a College of Letters and Science, a School of Engineering, and a School of Education were established, but he wasn't there long enough to see any
Wellman: significant development in those areas. He resigned, effective July 1, 1962, to accept a position as president of an educational television foundation in New York City.

Gould's lasting contribution to the Santa Barbara campus and to the entire University was in conceiving and promoting the University's Education Abroad Program. That has been a highly successful program which has provided opportunity for hundreds of students--mainly juniors--from all university campuses to spend a year of study in a foreign university.

In the fall of 1958, I was given two special assignments relating to the Santa Barbara campus: (1) the liquidation of the Department of Industrial Arts and (2) the chairmanship of a special statewide committee to consider possible new technological programs for the campus.

After considering the matter at some length, the Regents decided to discontinue the Industrial Arts Department within a period of four academic years and directed the administration to present a plan for its orderly termination.

The Industrial Arts Department had been one of the strongest departments in the Santa Barbara College and in its predecessor, Santa Barbara State College. According to the campus proponents for retaining the industrial arts program--and there were many of them--the department was one of the best of its kind in the United States. It had a national reputation for training teachers of industrial arts for the high schools and junior colleges.

Chall: If the program was so good, why was it discontinued?

Wellman: Because the training which it offered was primarily vocational in character and clearly belonged in the state colleges, not in the University. If there were to be a differentiation of function between the University and the state colleges--and the Regents believed that there should be--the training of the industrial arts teachers should be in the exclusive province of the state colleges. That decision was made despite the fact that a new building on the Goleta campus, designed to house the art and industrial arts departments, was nearing completion.

At the time the decision to discontinue the industrial arts program was made, the University administration recognized the importance of replacing it with a University-level program in
Wellman: technological studies for undergraduate students. There was clearly a need for one or more programs that would attract male students. After the veterans of World War II had graduated around 1950, Santa Barbara College enrolled more women students than men students, and that situation continued through the 1950s and into the 1960s.

The committee on possible new technological studies for Santa Barbara, of which I was the chairman, held quite a few meetings and there was extended discussion of alternatives. Members of the committee from the Santa Barbara campus argued strongly for a department of architecture, but that didn't seem to the other members of the committee to offer promise for a substantial expansion in the enrollment of male students.

The decision was finally made by the committee to recommend the establishment of a School of Engineering. In recommending a School of Engineering rather than a College of Engineering, the other committee members yielded to those from the Santa Barbara campus who argued that students, who intended to major in engineering, should spend their first two years in the College of Letters and Science in order to obtain a well-rounded education.

The School of Engineering was authorized by the Regents in January, 1961, and the first students enrolled the following September.

Chall: How did you terminate the Department of Industrial Arts? It must have been quite difficult.

Wellman: It was. The faculty who had been members of the department in 1944, when the State College was transferred to the University, were accorded legal tenure under the bill passed by the state legislature which authorized the transfer. By 1958 they were the senior members of the department and were influential in the affairs of the campus.

Fortunately, we had four years, beginning in 1959-60, to complete the liquidation of the program. During that time we were able to find acceptable alternatives for all of the faculty. One man was transferred to UCLA and another was transferred to Berkeley. Those two campuses were persuaded to accept the individuals on the grounds that they would thereby obtain an additional FTE which they could retain after the individuals had retired. One member of the industrial arts faculty became registrar on the Santa Barbara campus; another became dean of
Wellman: students on that campus. Two or three—I don't recall the exact number—were transferred to the newly established School of Education. Also, one man was transferred to the language department at Santa Barbara and taught elementary German. Another member of the department resigned to accept a high-level position with the U.S. Peace Corps in Washington, D.C.

All of the transfers worked out reasonably well except in the case of the person who was transferred to the Berkeley campus. After a few years, he agreed to retire early following a year's sabbatical and a year's leave of absence with full pay. I must say that it took quite a bit of doing to persuade the other departments on the Santa Barbara campus to accept transfers from the Department of Industrial Arts. They would have preferred to hire younger and better-trained scholars in their particular fields. Also, I may say, that I am glad that I didn't have to undertake the liquidation of any other department.

Chancellor Cheadle's Tenure

Wellman: Cheadle, as I have said, became chancellor of the Santa Barbara campus July 1, 1962, following the resignation of Samuel Gould. Gould had made a start, although only a bare one, in moving the campus to a university-level institution. Cheadle had the knowledge, drive, and perseverance to move what had been for so many years an unwanted appendage of the University to a full and respected member of the family, and he did so within a very short time.

Cheadle told me on more than one occasion that, in order to change the campus into a University-level campus, he had to add a large number of University-level faculty members—a large enough number to outvote and outinfluence the oldtime faculty members who were not really qualified to carry out the new mission of the campus and who longed for the good old times. He also knew that, in order to attract the kind of faculty members he wanted, he had to provide them with reasonably adequate facilities; otherwise, they would go elsewhere.

Cheadle also recognized the facts of life with regard to obtaining increased operating and capital outlay budgets. They were directly related to the current and prospective student enrollments. He, therefore, set as his goal rapid growth and,
Wellman: as his policy, admission of all qualified students even though they overloaded both the current teaching staff and the physical facilities.

Between 1962-63, the first year Cheadle was chancellor of the Santa Barbara campus, and 1967-68, my last year in the University, undergraduate enrollment at Santa Barbara rose from 4,516 students to 10,286 students; and graduate enrollment rose from 264 students to 1,490 students. Numbers of faculty members increased correspondingly. Many new buildings were completed or started.

One of the serious handicaps faced by the Santa Barbara campus was the inadequate amount of support per faculty member and per student. The level of expenditures for non-academic salaries, general assistance, supplies and expense, and equipment and facilities at Santa Barbara was substantially less than at the other campuses. We in the University-wide administration were never able to persuade the State Department of Finance that the support level per faculty member or per student at Santa Barbara should be brought up to the level of other campuses. Any increase in the support level per faculty member or per student was considered to be an improvement, and money for improvements were hard to come by.

Chancellor McHenry and the Santa Cruz Campus

Wellman: Dean E. McHenry was appointed chancellor of the Santa Cruz campus in July, 1961. He took up residence in Santa Cruz several months later.

I first met McHenry in 1949 on a trip for social scientists sponsored by the General Electric Company. He and I were the representatives from the University of California. Ten other social scientists were also on that trip. One of them was John A. Perkins, then professor of political science at the University of Michigan, and now vice-president--administration, at the University of California.

General Electric had for some years invited members of engineering faculties to meet with their staffs and visit their plants. The first time they had invited faculty members of social
Wellman: science departments was in 1949. Whether the company felt that the trip justified the time of their top staff (president and vice-president) and the expense of the visitors (all of our expenses were paid), I don't know. I personally learned a little about how a big company is managed.

I have already mentioned that McHenry was chairman of a study committee of the 1957 All-University Faculty Conference which recommended that the University add four new campuses; that he made an effective presentation of the need for doing so at the conference following the Regents' meeting in August, 1957; and that he was the University's member of the Master Plan Team.

McHenry was Kerr's chief advisor on planning. He served as academic assistant to President Kerr from 1958 to 1960 and as dean of academic planning from 1960 until he moved to Santa Cruz as chancellor of that campus.

Chall: Was the idea of small residential colleges first proposed by Kerr or McHenry?

Wellman: I don't know. I do know that both of them supported the concept wholeheartedly.

I had nothing to do with the academic plan or the physical development plan of the Santa Cruz campus. I was, of course, kept fully informed of the decisions as they were made.

My involvement with the Santa Cruz campus was concerned with the capital outlay budget, the annual operating budget, faculty appointments, and merit salary increases. I do not recall that I objected to any of McHenry's recommendations in these areas. He was a conservative administrator. He may have been too conservative in his recommendations.

Chall: How do you rate Dr. McHenry as a chancellor?

Wellman: I rate him highly, given the particular plan adopted for the Santa Cruz campus. I was, for example, amazed and pleased by his ability to obtain private gifts for construction of the residential areas of the colleges that the state would not provide. He also recruited a good faculty, a better University-type faculty than would normally be expected for a campus that was so largely oriented to undergraduate instruction.
Wellman: My chief reservation about the Santa Cruz plan was that it was too largely based on undergraduate instruction; that it did not provide adequately for graduate instruction. I had the feeling that, while it would be very attractive to undergraduate students, it would not be attractive to graduate students. In this respect it was just the opposite of the San Diego campus which favored graduate students over undergraduate students. Among the three new campuses, I felt that Irvine struck the best balance between undergraduate and graduate emphasis.

The astronomers of Lick Observatory were moved from Mount Hamilton to the Santa Cruz campus but not without considerable objection on their part. They had had from the beginning, back in 1888, a very favorable situation: almost exclusive use of the telescopes; no undergraduate responsibilities, only as many graduate students as they wanted; accommodations for distinguished visitors; and free (or low-rent) housing for themselves. William Wallace Campbell, the tenth president of the University, had been appointed director of the Lick Observatory in 1901. He continued as director while holding the office of president.

There were two reasons for moving the Lick Observatory astronomers from Mount Hamilton to Santa Cruz: (1) to give more time on the telescopes to astronomers located on other campuses, particularly Berkeley, Los Angeles, and San Diego and (2) to provide the Santa Cruz campus with a distinguished department at the graduate level, something it very much needed. Only time will tell whether that move weakened the astronomical research of the Lick Observatory as some of the Lick astronomers feared that it would.
VII THE BOARD OF REGENTS

Committee Structure

Chall: Why don't we talk now about the Regents? I am interested in how the board operates with respect to the president and his staff.

Wellman: Let me describe how the board operated during the time I attended its meetings. Whether there have been significant changes in its operations since then, I do not know.

The main work of the Board of Regents was done through committees--each composed of five to seven members. All Regents were free to attend the committee meetings.

Items to be included on the agenda of the committees were in the main determined by the president of the University in consultation with the vice-presidents and the chancellors. Any Regent was free to have an item placed on any agenda, and some of them occasionally did. The treasurer and the general counsel also placed items on the agenda.

Most of the items on the agenda were for action at that meeting. Other items, including very important ones and controversial ones, were frequently placed on the agenda for discussion at one meeting with the expectation that they would be on the agenda for action at the next meeting. An item that was up for action at one meeting would, if requested by a Regent, usually be deferred until the next meeting. Occasionally, an item was of such urgency that it should be decided without delay. The president and his staff made a special effort to look ahead and to place important items before the Regents in plenty of time for thorough consideration by them and to allow deferral until the next meeting without extreme hardship.
Wellman: Agenda items for action were accompanied by a statement of the action desired (essentially a motion), an explanation, and a justification. These statements were sent to all Regents in advance of the meetings, not just to the members of the relevant committee. Thus, any Regent, not a member of the particular committee having a special interest in an item, could attend the meeting of the committee and take part in the discussion.

Chall: Could he or she vote?

Wellman: No, not in the committee meeting, but such Regents could, of course, vote when the matter came before the full board. Sometimes, instead of taking action on an item, the committee referred it to the full board without recommendation.

The agenda of the board usually consisted of a report by the president highlighting the activities of the University since the last meeting, and reports by the several committees of the board including both standing committees and special committees.

The length of the board meetings varied considerably from meeting to meeting depending upon the extent of discussion among the Regents themselves; the questions asked by the Regents; and the replies made by the president, the vice-presidents, and the chancellors. Usually, the recommendations of the committees were approved by the board, but occasionally they were deferred for more information or disapproved. Vote in the board was by roll call of the members present--the roll call being alphabetical.

The four standing committees of the board, which had the most work to do during the time I was vice-president of the University, were the Committee on Educational Policy, the Committee on Finance, the Committee on Grounds and Buildings, and the Committee on Investments.

During the latter half of the 1950s and the first half of the 1960s, the Committee on Grounds and Buildings was particularly busy. That was the period of very large physical expansion of the University--no doubt the greatest ten-year period of physical expansion in the history of the University. Many new buildings were authorized and constructed. Each new building required determination as to precise location, appointment of an architect, and approval of schematic plans.
Wellman: The general locations of the proposed buildings were shown in the physical development plan of the campus.

Active Interest in Physical Development of the Campuses

Chall: A physical development plan was prepared for each campus?

Wellman: Yes. The Regents, especially those on the Committee on Grounds and Buildings, took an active interest in those plans and made suggestions about them. And, of course, the plans were subject to the approval of the Committee on Grounds and Buildings and of the full board.

The actual physical development plans were drawn up by a private architectural firm, one for each campus, appointed by the Regents. Private landscape architects were also employed. The University-wide and the campus Offices of Architects and Engineers worked closely with the private architectural firms.

The chancellors themselves took an active part in the development of the plans. And President Kerr played a leading role in the development of each of the campus plans. When he was chancellor of the Berkeley campus, Kerr had initiated and carried through a physical development plan for the campus. I should also mention that vice-president Elmo Morgan and chief architect Robert Evans made many contributions to the campus's physical development plans.

Chall: The Regents appointed the architects for all of the new buildings? That wasn't delegated to the administration?

Wellman: The administration submitted the name of one architect which was usually accepted by the committee but often after long discussion.

At the meetings of the Committee on Grounds and Buildings, I was much impressed by the deep concern which the members had about the exterior appearance of the buildings to be constructed. Schematic drawings presented by the building architect with the approval of the campus supervising architect and the campus administration were frequently sent back by the committee with suggestions for modification. And, in most, perhaps in all cases, the modified drawings were an improvement.
Wellman: The State Department of Finance and the office of the Legislative Analyst tended to oppose embellishments on buildings which added to their cost but not to their usefulness even when the added cost was miniscule. This irked the Regents as much as it did the University administration. One day Regent Donald H. McLaughlin ironically commented, "The State Department of Finance doesn't necessarily want a building to be cheap, it just wants it to look cheap."

The schematic drawings of a building were sometimes more attractive than the constructed building. I do not claim to have any artistic taste but, to me, several of the buildings on the Berkeley campus are anything but attractive in appearance.

Chall: What buildings are you thinking about?

Wellman: Three in particular: The Social Science Building (Barrows Hall), the Environmental Design Building (Wurster Hall), and the Mathematics Building (Evans Hall).

Wurster Hall was designed by three architects of the University faculty. One evening at a big dinner at the Men's Faculty Club on the Berkeley campus, shortly after Wurster Hall was completed, I expressed my opinion of its exterior appearance only to discover that the man across the table from me was one of the three architects. I did not apologize, but I did change the subject of the conversation.

To my mind, both Barrows Hall and Evans Hall would have looked better if they were not so tall. Incidentally, in both cases the original schematic drawings called for lower height. And in each case an extra story was added because of the availability of money.

In the case of Barrows Hall, the construction bids came in sufficiently lower than the state funds appropriated for its construction to permit the addition of another story. Also, the entire area above the roof to the top of the elevator shafts was enclosed and developed. Hence, in appearance, two stories were added.

An extra story was added to Evans Hall as the result of a grant from the federal government for faculty research space. Obtaining that grant resulted in a delay of about two years in the construction of the building; during those two years the
Wellman: cost of construction rose substantially, and the increase in cost of the state funded part of the building was about equal to the federal grant.

I have used the Committee on Grounds and Buildings to illustrate the dedication of the Regents to the University and the large amount of time which they devoted to its affairs. The same dedication was shown in the other committees of the board--both the standing committees and the special committees.

Chall: What were some of the special committees?

Wellman: During the years I was vice-president of the University, there were at different times four special committees of the Regents of very substantial importance: the Special Committee to Resurvey the Pension and Retiring Annuities System, the Special Committee on the Selection of New Campus Sites, the Special Committee to Review University Policies, and the Special Committee on the Appointment of a President.

The Special Committee to Resurvey the Pension and Retiring Annuities System recommended, and the board approved, that the University establish its own retirement system rather than become a part of the state retirement system. I thought at the time that University faculty members would be better off under the state retirement system than under a separate University retirement system. However, I did not argue strongly for the state retirement system, mainly because I personally would have benefited greatly by it, and I did not want to be charged with seeking my own self-interest.

Several of the Regents, including Hagar, Heller, McLaughlin, and Steinhart felt strongly that University employees would have better protection in retirement under the state retirement system than under a separate University retirement system, but they were unable to convince the majority of the Regents of the correctness of their viewpoint. In my judgment time has proven the minority right and the majority wrong at least so far as those who have thus far retired are concerned.
Influential Regents

Chall: During your years as vice-president of the University and acting president, which Regents, in your opinion, had the most influence on University affairs?

Wellman: Before attempting to answer that question, let me say that no Regent or small clique of Regents dominated the University. Every Regent's actions required a majority vote of the Regents present. (Appointment or dismissal of the president of the University required a favorable vote of thirteen Regents, the total number of Regents being twenty-four.

Now, as to the more influential Regents whom I knew--listing them alphabetically--I would include: Philip L. Boyd, Edward W. Carter, Dorothy B. Chandler, Gerald H. Hagar, Donald H. McLaughlin, Theodore R. Meyer, Edwin W. Pauley, and Jesse H. Steinhart. I would also include the Hellers--Edward H. Heller, who died in December, 1961, and his wife, Elinor R. Heller, who was appointed to fill the unexpired term of her husband.

There were many other dedicated Regents. In fact, most, although perhaps not all, of the appointed Regents were dedicated to promoting what they believed to be the welfare of the University. They differed among themselves on many issues, but most of them felt strongly that the University of California should be the greatest university in the world. And many of them, especially those that I have named, devoted a lot of their time to promoting that goal.

Other than the presidents of the University, who were also Regents, Theodore R. Meyer was by far the most influential of the ex-officio Regents. He was an ex-officio Regent by virtue of being president of the Mechanics Institute. He was the only ex-officio Regent as far as I know to be elected chairman of the Finance Committee and chairman of the board. He was chairman of the board when I was acting president, and he was of great help to me. Other Regents who were especially helpful to me during those trying months were Phillip L. Boyd, Edward W. Carter, Dorothy B. Chandler, William K. Coblentz, William E. Forbes, Elinor H. Heller, DeWitt A. Higgs, and Edwin W. Pauley.

I should also say that Governor Ronald Reagan was a most influential Regent during my year as acting president, but I wouldn't say that his presence at the Regents' meetings was
Wellman: helpful in getting the work of the Regents done expeditiously.

Chall: Why do you say that?

Wellman: The character of the Regents' meetings changed considerably after Reagan became governor. Unlike his predecessors, Reagan attended the Regents' meetings regularly. He took an active part in the discussions and tried, it seemed to me, to dominate the board. His presence and comments at the meetings attracted many reporters and many spectators. A large room had to be made available for the meetings, and microphones had to be installed at each Regent's place so that the audience could hear what was said. The Speaker of the Assembly, Jesse M. Unruh--who was an ex-officio Regent--began to attend the board meetings. He was a Democrat while Reagan was a Republican. Their comments began to take on political overtones, and the Regents' meetings became something of a spectacle. Chancellor Murphy once characterized them during that year as "the best traveling show in California."

A Critique of Long Terms and the Ex-officio Status

Chall: What do you think about the long terms of office for the Regents?

Wellman: I favor them. The University has grown great under them. That, it seems to me, is the real test of value of long terms for the Regents. Long terms free the Regents from having to base their decisions about the University on political considerations. They may do so when first appointed but, as soon as they become well acquainted with the operations of the University, they tend to put its interests above partisan politics. Also, sixteen-year terms for appointed Regents prevents a governor from packing the board unless that governor serves more than two, four-year terms. Two Regents are appointed every two years.

While I favor long terms for appointed Regents, I do not favor having ex-officio Regents except the president of the University.

Chall: Why do you feel that way about ex-officio Regents?

Wellman: The governor, the lieutenant governor, and the speaker of the assembly necessarily have to put political considerations first
Wellman: and, when there is a conflict between political considerations and University welfare, as there frequently is, University welfare comes out last.

The state superintendent of public instruction is also an elected official and, while freer from partisan politics than the governor, lieutenant governor, and speaker of the assembly, nevertheless, has to pay some attention to politics.

I also doubt the advisability of having the president of the State Board of Agriculture and the president of the Mechanics Institute serve on the Board of Regents. They represent special interest groups, and there is no longer any justification for those groups being represented on the Board of Regents and other special interest groups, such as labor and manufacturing, being omitted. In my judgment, no special interest group should have a spokesman on the Board of Regents.

Before leaving the discussion of the Board of Regents, I should like to relate an incident which I observed shortly after I became vice-president—agricultural sciences. That was an astute performance by Regent John Francis Neylan. Neylan was a powerful Regent and, I have been told, a very constructive one up to the time of the loyalty oath.

He had been appointed for a sixteen-year term in 1928 and reappointed for another sixteen-year term in 1944. He resigned in 1955 partly, I suspect, because he had given up hope of getting Sproul fired.

At a Regents' meeting held in San Francisco in the spring of 1953, some of the Regents had demanded the immediate dismissal of an assistant professor whose comments in his classroom, as reported in the Daily Californian, seemed to support communism. A day or two before the meeting, President Sproul had given me a copy of the statement that he proposed to present to the Regents and asked me whether the evidence contained therein justified dismissal. I told him that, in my judgment, it did not. Whether my advice influenced him I do not know, but he did recommend against dismissal.

Both the ad hoc committee and the Academic Senate Budget Committee had recommended, solely on the basis of academic performance, that the assistant professor should not be reappointed as of the following July 1; Chancellor Kerr had agreed with their judgment and had, I believe, so informed the candidate.
Wellman: when an antagonistic governor took office would set a bad precedent that would adversely affect higher education throughout the country.

Chall: Do you think he was right?

Wellman: I have no way of knowing. I suspect that Kerr's own reputation in academic circles in this country and, perhaps, even abroad was enhanced rather than damaged. Also, I am fairly certain that his dismissal brought him a lot more faculty and student support than he would have had had he resigned. A part of that support may have stemmed from anger at the Regents who voted to dismiss him.

Before taking up my experience as acting president, three other events should be mentioned.

A few days after Governor Reagan took office, he called a conference of the heads of the several departments of the state government at which he outlined, in general terms, the proposed governor's budget for 1967-68. The University was invited to send a representative. Kerr was still in the Orient. I asked Charles J. Hitch, vice-president--administration, to attend. The next morning he told me that a meeting on the University's budget with Gordon Smith, the new director of the State Department of Finance, was scheduled a few days hence and that I should attend it since the University would likely be faced with a drastic reduction in state funds.

The University's operating budget request for 1967-68 amounted to $278 million as against a state appropriation of $240 million in the current year (1966-67), the same percentage increase as the projected increase in student weighted average enrollment. The State Department of Finance had, before Reagan was inaugurated, recommended a state appropriation of $264 million based entirely upon workload without any funds for improvements. The University would, I think, have acceded to the Finance Department's figure and supported it before the legislative committees even though it was below what we felt was fully justified and was a greater percentage reduction than any we had experienced in recent years. We knew that higher education would be faced with greater competition for state funds owing to the recently expanded social welfare programs adopted by the legislature and approved by Governor Brown but only partially funded.
Wellman: President Sproul had read his statement recommending against immediate dismissal just before recess for lunch. When the meeting was resumed, most of the Regents had long and foreboding faces. I thought that the majority of them had decided to vote against Sproul's recommendation. Discussion of the case began. Chancellor Kerr made what I felt was an effective statement against dismissal, but it did not seem to have any effect. There were still the same stern expressions on the faces of most of the Regents.

Then Regent Neylan, who always sat at one end of the Regents' table, stated the case for dismissal so effectively that I was almost convinced that I had been wrong in recommending to Sproul against dismissal. I thought to myself, "Too bad, Sproul and Kerr have lost this one." However, Regent Neylan went on to say, "If we vote to dismiss the misguided young man, we'll make a martyr out of him and we don't want to do that; he'll be gone in a few months anyway, so let's take no action." His advice was followed. I did not learn until many months later that Kerr had discussed the matter with Neylan several days before the Regents' meeting.

The Firing of Clark Kerr and Some of the Background

Chall: You told me that you did not think Governor Reagan expected to be able to get rid of Clark Kerr as president of the University so early in his term.

Wellman: That is my impression, based not, however, on anything that I personally heard Governor Reagan say but rather upon what some of the Regents told me.

It is my understanding that Kerr, himself, gave those Regents who wanted to get rid of him the opportunity to do so at the January, 1967, meeting of the Regents. I did not know that at the time; I learned of it later.

Chall: Did he offer to resign?

Wellman: No; but at a conference that morning with the chairman of the board, Theodore R. Meyer, and the vice-chairman, Dorothy B. Chandler, Kerr said that if he was going to be fired anytime soon, it should be then; that he would not be able to negotiate effectively with the officials in Sacramento over the University's budget if the threat of dismissal was hanging over his head; and that, in order to continue, he needed assurance of the board's support. That gave those Regents on the board who had been advocating Kerr's dismissal for the past year or so the opportunity they had been seeking. They pressed for immediate action, and they persuaded enough of the other Regents to join them to vote Kerr out of office. His dismissal was made effective that day--January 20, 1967.
Wellman: I became acting president of the University on that same day. It was not a position that I wanted.

Chall: Then why did you accept it? You had already passed normal retirement age, hadn't you?

Wellman: Yes; I would normally have retired July 1, 1966. I had agreed to stay on one additional year at the request of President Kerr and the Regents. I had made definite plans to retire July 1, 1967. In fact, I had reservations on a ship out of New York to the Norwegian fiords.

I accepted, I suppose, out of sense of loyalty to the University, the Regents, the administration, and the faculty. The University of California had been exceedingly good to me. I had grown to love her. She was in trouble. I could not refuse to do whatever I could to help her.

After the Regents had voted to dismiss Kerr at the Regents' only session, they called him in and notified him of their action. They then called in the vice-presidents and chancellors and told them what they had done, after which there was a brief recess.

During the recess, the chairman of the board, Theodore R. Meyer, the vice-chairman of the board, Dorothy B. Chandler, and the chairman of the Committee on Finance, Edward W. Carter, urged me to take over. Apparently, the Regents were ready to appoint me president. Regent Carter said as much at that time and, in his statement at my retirement dinner in July, 1968, Regent Pauley also said so.

Chall: Why didn't you accept the offer? Wouldn't the title of president have given you much more prestige than the title of acting president?

Wellman: Yes, undoubtedly. But, I didn't think it would be best for the University. I knew that the faculty would be irate over the firing of Kerr without having been consulted or even informed in advance, and I felt that the breach between the faculty and the Regents would be seriously widened and might become too wide to be soon mended, if the Regents appointed a president without faculty advice. I, therefore, told the three Regents that I would accept the position of acting president rather than president. Kerr, who was present at the time, concurred with my decision.
Wellman: When he was notified of his immediate dismissal, Kerr asked to continue until the end of that Regents' meeting; there were still important items to consider. Kerr conducted himself with calmness and dignity. I was grateful that I did not have to take over at that moment. There might have been tears in my voice if not in my eyes.

Chall: Were you aware that President Kerr was in serious trouble with the Regents prior to the day he was fired?

Wellman: Yes. Kerr told me what had happened at a dinner given by Regent H.R. Haldeman in honor of governor-elect Ronald Reagan at the time of the November, 1966, meeting of the Regents. At the dinner, one or two Regents--friendly to Kerr--suggested to him that he should look for another position.

Sometime later, I made a special trip to Southern California, at Kerr's request, to talk with other Regents friendly to Kerr who had not, at the Haldeman dinner, warned Kerr that he might be subject to dismissal. Kerr wanted their judgment of his future as president. On my return, I reported my findings to Kerr, namely, that his tenure as president was indeed precarious and that there was strong probability that he would be dismissed before the end of the fiscal year (1966-67) unless he resigned in the meantime.

All of the Regents with whom I had talked had assured me that they would support Kerr's continuance in office until July 1 provided he soon announced his resignation to be effective at that time.

I urged Kerr to resign effective July 1, 1967. I thought it would be better for the University and for him personally to do so rather than wait to be fired. Six months' notice of Kerr's resignation would have given the Regents time to select a new president. My advice to Kerr may also have been influenced by my fear that, if he were dismissed, I might have to serve as acting president until a new president took office. That prospect was anything but attractive to me.

At one time I thought that Kerr was inclined toward my viewpoint. But when he left for the Orient after the December meeting of the Regents, a commitment he had made some months before, he told me that he had decided not to resign. He felt that for a president of a state university to resign voluntarily
At the beginning of the meeting, Director of Finance Smith stated that the state would be faced with a serious financial situation in 1967-68 and that it would be necessary to reduce state appropriations below the Department of Finance's projections by an average of 10 percent.

For the University, that would mean $238 million (264 million minus $26 million) or $2 million less than the 1966-67 state appropriation. We were dismayed. The University could not possibly operate with less money and, at the same time, accept 15 percent more students. Costs were going up, and more money rather than less would be required with no increase in enrollment.

More bad news was yet to come. The state appropriation to the University was to be reduced by an additional $46 million bringing it down to $192 million. This further reduction in state funds was to be largely offset by the use of Regents' funds and by the imposition of a tuition of $400 a year. Funds to start year-round operation at Berkeley were also eliminated.

I hardly need say that the University's representatives were stunned. I told Gordon Smith that the University could not possibly accept the proposals, and we would, of course, have to inform the Regents of the grave threat to the University. He said that he would like to appear before the Regents, and he implied that he was confident that he could persuade them that the governor's budget proposals were reasonable in view of the serious financial situation facing the state.

The next morning I reported to the chairman of the board, Theodore R. Meyer, the gist of the governor's proposed budget request for the University and suggested that a special meeting of the board might be advisable. I next telephoned the vice-chairman of the board, Dorothy B. Chandler, in Los Angeles and started to tell her what the governor's budget request for the University would be. She interrupted me and asked if I had seen that morning's issue of the Los Angeles Times. I said no. She said, "You had better get a copy. The full story is there."

I immediately got a copy and read the story written by William Tromley, educational writer for the Los Angeles Times. It could not have been more accurate and complete if Tromley himself had been at the meeting. Someone who was at the meeting or who knew what was going to be said must have leaked the information to Tromley. The governor's office charged that the
Wellman: University administration leaked the story in order to embarrass the governor. I very much doubt that anyone connected with the University was responsible. I have never found out who was.

Regent Chandler concurred with me that under the circumstances a special meeting of the Regents should be held soon. I so recommended to the chairman of the board, and he called a special meeting to be held on the UCLA campus on January 9, 1967.

Incidentally, I would have much preferred that, instead of a special meeting of the full board, a special meeting of the Finance Committee could have been held at either the Los Angeles or San Francisco airport.

Chall: Why wasn't that done?

Wellman: There were no standing committees of the board in existence at that time. They had been discontinued the previous October; in their place the board met as a Committee of the Whole.

After a few more months' experience without standing committees, I proposed that they be restored. That was done in July.

As might have been expected, in view of the Tromley story, the special meeting of the Regents, held in the Faculty Center on the UCLA campus, was attended by quite a few newspaper reporters and many students. The room was overcrowded.

Gordon Smith asked for a podium and microphone. He clearly wanted to talk to the audience as well as to the Regents. Unfortunately, from his standpoint and probably also from the standpoint of good relations between the governor's office and the University administration, he was booed by students and sharply criticized by several Regents. Then, too, before Smith got up to speak, President Kerr had presented a brief and rather devastating analysis of the governor's proposals and thereby blunted whatever effectiveness Smith's presentation might otherwise have had. I suspect that Smith felt that he had not had a fair hearing, and he probably blamed the University administration.

The only action taken at that meeting was to authorize the chairman of the board to appoint a number of Regents to give advice and assistance to the University administration in discussions with the state administration on matters relating to the University
Wellman: budget. That action was taken at the request of President Kerr. It would not have been necessary if the Regents' Committee on Finance had still been in existence.

The third incident which worsened the relations between the University administration and the governor's office was a telegram which I sent to the chancellors asking them to delay the sending of letters of admission for the fall (1967) term. That suggestion was made by Chancellor Mrak and approved by President Kerr. It was intended that the delay would be temporary and only until the meeting of chancellors the following week at which coordination among the campuses as to timing would be worked out. Somehow the telegram was leaked to the Riverside press and was blown up all out of proportion. Governor Reagan took the request for delay of admission letters as a personal affront, charging that it was done to embarrass him. Several months later, at a dinner meeting of the Council of Chancellors to which Governor Reagan was invited, I tried to tell him the reasons for the temporary delay in sending out the admission letters and that any embarrassment to him was entirely unintentional. I doubt that he believed me.

Wellman Assumes Responsibility

Wellman: The situation then with which the University was confronted when I became acting president included poor relations between the University administration and the governor and his director of finance; an outraged faculty owing to the summary dismissal of the president without even the courtesy of prior consultation with them; and grave threats of totally inadequate state support--abrogation of the long-standing agreement on the division of overhead receipts between the University and the state; and imposition of tuition.

I had hoped to have sufficient time before the next regular meeting of the Regents, scheduled for February 16-17, 1967, to develop, after consulting with the vice-presidents and chancellors, an effective strategy for dealing with the triple problems--level of state support, use of Regents' funds, and tuition. The Regents, at their January, 1967, meeting, had adopted several resolutions: that the educational quality of the University shall be maintained, that the University administration shall review its budget proposals
Wellman: to achieve all possible economies without sacrificing educational quality, and that the board should reach a decision on tuition no later than March 1, 1967.

The University Budget and Reduced State Funds

Wellman: Four Regents--Coblentz, Dutton, Forbes, and Simon--called a special meeting to be held on February 3, 1967, to give further consideration to budget and tuition. They apparently felt that these matters could not wait until the regularly scheduled meeting in mid-February. Moreover, I suspect, they did not fully trust the Regents who had been appointed to advise the University on budget matters.

I had laryngitis and could hardly speak. I should have stayed home.

There was much discussion pro and con about the needed budget for the University and how much of it would be provided by state appropriation, use of Regents' funds, and tuition. Three significant changes in the proposals, advanced by Director of Finance Smith at the special Regents' meeting on January 9, were announced by the governor. Funds for year-round operations at Berkeley would be restored; use of Regents' funds would be limited to 1967-68, and thereafter the previous division of overhead income (one-half to the state and one-half to the University) would prevail; and tuition would be around $250-$280 a year instead of the earlier figure of $400 a year. The governor's budget for the University would then provide:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From state appropriation</td>
<td>$196,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From balances in Regents' funds</td>
<td>22,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From tuition</td>
<td>20,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$238,000,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The restoration of funds for year-round operation did not improve the financial position of the University. The restoration merely covered the direct costs. Without the restoration of funds, year-round operation would not have been undertaken and the costs related thereto would not have been incurred. In retrospect, it would have been just as well if the governor had stuck to his original decision to defer the year-round operation
Wellman: for a year. If that had been done, year-round operation would likely have been deferred indefinitely instead of being conducted at Berkeley for two years and at Los Angeles for one year, and then dying from lack of funds.

Another special meeting of the Regents, called by Chairman Meyer on my recommendation, was held at Santa Barbara on February 15, 1967, the day preceding that month's regular meeting. Alternative budgets, prepared by the University administration in response to the Regents' request made at the special meeting on February 3, were presented and considered. No action was taken, but it was made clear to all Regents present (except Rafferty and Reagan) that an operating budget for 1967-68 of $238 million was grossly inadequate.

At the regular meetings of the Regents held during the next two days, February 16-17, several important steps regarding the budget were taken.

First, the Regents approved a proposal that had been worked out jointly by the University administration and the State Department of Finance. Vice-President Hitch had played a key role. The proposal involved a one-time contribution of Regents' funds--overhead receipts and reserves--totaling $20 million and renewal of the 1963 Memorandum of Understanding concerning disposition of overhead receipts--one-half to the state and one-half to the University.

Chall: Wasn't $20 million a pretty steep price to pay?

Wellman: It might appear so at first glance. Yet, it was, I think, quite favorable to the University on balance. What the University actually lost was $3 million plus one-half of the potential overhead receipts in some future year. In the 1963 Memorandum of Understanding, the immediate past year's overhead receipts were allocated; in the renewed Memorandum of Understanding, the overhead receipts would be allocated on a current basis. Thus, for 1967-68 and each year thereafter, the University traded one-half of the previous year for one-half of the overhead receipts in the current year. On the other hand, the state would receive in 1967-68 all of the overhead receipts (its share plus the University's share) in 1966-67 together with its share of the overhead receipts in 1967-68.

The Legislative Analyst, Allen A. Post, in commenting on the governor's 1967-68 budget request for the University, had strongly
Wellman: urged that all of the overhead receipts go to the state. Hence, it was a substantial victory for the University to have Governor Reagan continue the Memorandum of Understanding. If total overhead receipts continued at the estimated 1967-68 level for eight years (Reagan's two terms as governor), the University would receive a total of $60 million during that period. I understand that overhead receipts have grown substantially since 1967-68.

The Regents next approved a reduction in the funds for operation of the University in 1967-68 from $278 million to $264 million, the amount the State Department of Finance had originally determined was necessary for support of the University with a 15 percent increase in enrollment but without any improvements in programs. Governor Reagan voted against the reduced budget. In his opinion, it was still too large.

With the adoption of the revised budget, which provided only for estimated workload needs, I wanted to leave admissions policy and, by implication, recruitment of new faculty quite flexible. I therefore proposed that admissions policy be administered so as to admit the largest possible number of qualified students consistent with the maintenance of quality of instruction. This proposal had been discussed at the meeting of the chancellors a day or so before, and they had favored it. It was approved by a narrow majority of the Regents.

After it was approved, however, several of the chancellors urged the board to adopt in addition a stated amount with which they would be permitted to recruit new faculty. After quite a lot of discussion, Regent Carter moved that the administration be authorized to proceed to admit students and procure faculty for 1967-68 on the basis of a $255 million annual level of expenditure. The motion was approved by a vote of 16 to 3. Governor Reagan abstained, indicating that in his judgment the figure was not too far out. I voted for the motion. President Kerr and I had discussed, following the special meeting of the Regents on January 9, a possible settlement at around that figure or possibly a bit lower.

Chall: Did Regent Carter get the figure from you?

Wellman: Not that I recall. He may have gotten it from President Kerr before he was fired. Also, Regent Carter was very astute in all University matters—budgetary and otherwise; and it may be that he had concluded that $255 million was the maximum amount
Wellman: that could be expected under the circumstances and, also, that the risk of having the University underwrite any larger amount was too great. At that time, the governor was still holding to a University budget of only $238 million.

In an article in the next morning's Los Angeles Times, William Tromley reported that the Regents had reduced the University's budget request for 1967-68 from $278 million to $255 million. Hitch and I tried to convince Tromley that he was wrong—that the reduction was only to $264 million not to $255 million. He replied that approval of Regent Carter's motion announced to all concerned that the University could get by on $255 million and that we should not expect to get much more than that. How right he was!

The Regents then took up the matter of tuition. At the January meeting, they had agreed to take a position on tuition—whether in favor or opposed—no later than March 1. After a lengthy discussion, they voted "to make no change in its long-established nontuition policy for California students through the Spring Quarter of 1968." That action meant, of course, that the governor could not depend upon tuition to help finance the University's operations in 1967-68. He submitted a revised request for state funds for the University totaling $231 million which, with the Regents contribution of $20 million, would provide a level of support of $251 million.

The University administration, with the help of a number of Regents, worked very hard to get the legislature to increase the state appropriation to $244 million which, with the Regents contribution of $20 million, would have brought the University to the $264 million level. The Democratic-controlled assembly approved $240 million. Jesse Unruh, speaker of the assembly and an ex-officio Regent, had a good deal to do with that favorable outcome. However, the senate approved only $232 million. The conference committee recommended $237 million and that amount was approved by both of the houses.

We could have squeezed by with that amount. It, together with the $20 million of Regents' funds, would have provided an expenditure level of $257 million. A shortfall was occurring in student applications, and the actual increase in enrollment in 1967-68 turned out to be less than originally expected. The governor vetoed all of the increases added by the legislature, so we ended up just where we started except that no tuition was exacted.
Wellman: To complete the 1967-68 budget story, the Regents voted in September to allocate $4 million of Regents' funds to provide for the most urgent items that could not be funded within the state appropriation.

The Question of Tuition

Chall: You said that the Regents voted against the imposition of tuition for the budget year, 1967-68. Was there further discussion of the matter during the time you were acting president?

Wellman: Yes. Tuition was a live topic during 1967 and, I understand, for many months thereafter.

In voting against the establishment of tuition for 1967-68, the Regents did not foreclose its later establishment. They simply deferred a decision on a permanent policy pending a careful study of the matter.

At the meeting in February, the board appropriated $25,000 for a study of tuition and student financial aids in other institutions and asked that copies of the report be made available to the Regents in advance of the April meeting. It soon became apparent that it would take much longer than two months to provide meaningful analysis and that services of an outside agency would be necessary. Vice-President Frank Kidner had looked into the matter at my request and had recommended the employment of the College Entrance Examination Board. I so recommended it to the Regents at the March, 1967, meeting and they approved.

Frank Kidner was in overall charge of the study for the University-wide administration. He did an excellent job.

By the time the May meeting rolled around, it had become clear that a good deal more than $25,000 would be required for the tuition and financial-aid study. I, therefore, recommended to the Regents, and they approved, an additional appropriation of $45,000

The Regents insisted, and rightly so, that the study be completed in time to be considered in advance of consideration of the 1968-69 budget request. The target date of August 14 was
agreed upon at which time the study would be completed and a report mailed to the Regents.

In fact, two reports were prepared, one by the University administration under the leadership of Vice-President Kidner entitled "Tuition and Financial Aid Study" and the other by the College Entrance Examination Board entitled "Student Financial Aid Administration, Requirements, and Resources in the University of California."

A two-day meeting of the board was held in Los Angeles on August 30-31, 1967, at which the two reports, together with other matters relating to tuition and charges, were extensively discussed.

The Academic Council presented a statement in which the members unanimously and firmly opposed tuition even though all of it was used for student aid. That body contended that it was better to raise funds for student aid through taxes levied against the public rather than through a special tax upon students. The Council of Student Body Presidents also presented a statement in which it was contended that the added burden of tuition would make it impossible for many middle-class students to attend the University. A section of the Board of Regents reported that, since Governor Reagan had first proposed tuition, some 2,000 communications had been received of which 1,400 were opposed to the imposition of tuition and 600 were in favor.

The two studies showed without a question of doubt that, compared with fifty-eight public universities on which information had been obtained, financial aid to students at the University of California was inadequate and that the total fees paid by students at the University of California were lower than at any of the other fifty-eight public universities.

Most of the discussion at the August 30-31 meeting was, as you might suspect, among the Regents themselves.

Several motions were made. Regent Roth moved that the historical policy of the Regents of no tuition should be maintained. Regent Higgs offered a substitute motion that an entrance fee of $33 per quarter should be charged all students, other than all nonresident students, commencing with the 1968-69 fall quarter and that the funds should be used for an expanded program of financial aid to students. Regent Simon moved an amendment to the substitute
motion that the words "entrance fee" be changed to read "tuition fee." Regent Rafferty moved that the motions made by Regents Roth, Higgs, and Simon be tabled. That was done.

Governor Reagan then moved that the Regents adopt tuition as a policy of the University of California. After much discussion, his motion was defeated 14 to 7 with 2 abstentions.

In the course of the discussion, Regent Carter commented that he supported the concept of increasing the charge to students for support of the University but was opposed to voting abstractly on the matter of tuition without a precise statement of the uses to which the revenues would be put. Regent Unruh, on the other hand, felt that the board should face squarely the issue on the principle of tuition. Regent Chandler agreed with Regent Unruh's opinion that the board should reach a decision on the principle of tuition before determining the amount of tuition, if any, and uses to which it would be put.

Some of the Regents seemed to favor the imposition of a charge against the students for support of the University but did not want to use the word "tuition." Governor Reagan, sensing that feeling, moved that the Regents adopt a policy of a charge against the students with specific uses of the money to be determined by the Regents.

I was asked whether, in my opinion, there was any difference between Governor Reagan's motion that the Regents adopt tuition as a policy (which had been defeated) and his motion that the Regents adopt a policy of a charge against the students with specific uses of the money to be determined by the Regents. I replied that the governor's last motion included the possibility of payment by students for the cost of instruction which would constitute tuition. I went on to say that the basic question was that of assessing cost of instruction and research against the students as contrasted with imposing a charge for student related services, including student financial aid.

The final outcome of the two-day session was approval by voice vote of a motion made by Governor Reagan that a charge (the amount of which was to be recommended by a special committee) would be paid by all students, other than nonresidents, to finance a program of student aid, faculty enrichment, and/or other uses to be determined by the Regents and that the special committee recommend on the apportionment and specific uses of these funds.
Wellman: Why there wasn't a role call vote I don't remember. There should have been. Seven Regents requested that they be recorded as voting against the motion. I regret that I did not join them.

Chall: You were opposed to tuition?

Wellman: Yes, or more accurately speaking, I was opposed to an increase in tuition.

Chall: Was the University then levying a tuition charge against in-state students? I had always understood that the University was tuition-free for these students.

Wellman: That was the common understanding but it wasn't strictly true.

For many years, just how long I don't know, in-state students had been contributing to the cost of instruction. In 1921, the Regents established the incidental fee for the purpose of meeting a projected budget deficit and for providing noninstructional services for students. The initial fee was $25 per student per semester and was in addition to laboratory fees paid by students enrolled in laboratory courses. When laboratory fees were first established, I haven't been able to find out.

In 1946, the Regents eliminated the special laboratory fees and increased the incidental fee by $10 per student per semester on the grounds that students in nonlaboratory courses used other facilities of the University such as the library more intensively than students enrolled in laboratory courses and that all students should pay the same fee.

In 1962, the incidental fee income, instead of being merged with the general University income, was established as a restricted fund. However, an amount equal to $27 per student per year was transferred from this restricted fund to the University's general fund and used for support of departments of instruction and research. In 1967-68, that amounted to about 12 percent of the total incidental fee income for the University as a whole.

I was not opposed to increasing the incidental fee with the entire increase being allocated to student financial aid. Regent Higgs, as I mentioned, moved that an entrance fee of $33 per quarter be charged all in-state students and that the funds be used for an expanded program of financial aid to students. I was in favor of that motion, but it did not come to a vote. I did not then, and I do not now, consider that a compulsory fee for a
Wellman: student financial-aid program constitutes tuition. To my mind, tuition is a charge against students for their instruction.

I also had a fallback position which I had discussed with the vice-presidents and chancellors and with which most of them had concurred, namely, that the Regents announce their willingness to impose tuition provided the State legislature established tuition in the State colleges. If the financial situation in the State was so desperate that it was necessary for students in the University to contribute toward their education, then students in the State colleges should also contribute toward their education. I did not expect that the tuition fee in the State colleges would be as high as the tuition fee in the University.

I had also proposed in writing this idea to Regents Boyd and Meyer some time before the August 30-31 meeting of the board, but it did not strike a responsive chord with them. At least I did not get any response from them. I missed an opportunity to press this proposal at the August 30-31 meeting in connection with an amendment which Regent Dutton had offered to Governor Reagan's motion that the Regents adopt a policy of a charge against students with the specific uses of the money to be determined by the Board of Regents. Regent Dutton's amendment was to the effect that the charge shall not go into effect unless and until the legislature imposes a similar charge on State college students. The amendment was defeated by a vote of 17 to 2 with 4 abstentions. I was among the 4 who abstained.

To conclude the story on tuition during my year as acting president:

After voting to increase student charges—the amount and uses to be recommended by a special committee of the Regents—the board voted to have a special committee seek out additional or alternative sources of revenue that might be used to keep student charges to the lowest possible level. That committee met once in September, twice in October, and twice in November. I, of course, attended all of the meetings. At the regular meeting of the board, December 1, 1967, the chairman of the committee, Regent Higgs, reported that, because of the magnitude and complexity of its task, additional time would be needed.

Chall: From what you have said, it sounds as if most of the time of the Regents and of the University administration was taken up with matters relating to budgets and student charges.
A lot of time was devoted to those two issues. More meetings of the board were held during 1967 than at any other time in my memory. There were ten regular meetings and four special meetings.

The University, of course, had to carry on its regular business, and this took time of both the Regents and the administration.

One of the special and very important activities of the board in 1967 was to elect a new president. This took a lot of time of the special committee of the Regents under the chairmanship of Regent Philip Boyd. I was an ex-officio member of that committee. My chief function, as I saw it, was to insure that the faculty committee was fully consulted. There were no problems in that regard. Regent Boyd worked closely and harmoniously with the chairman of the faculty committee, Professor William S. Adams of the UCLA School of Medicine.

At the September, 1967, meeting, the Regents elected by unanimous vote Charles J. Hitch as the new president of the University, effective January 1, 1968. He was an excellent choice. In my judgment there couldn't have been a better choice at that particular time.

I continued to serve as acting president for the remainder of 1967 and, at the request of President Hitch and the Regents, resumed my former position as vice-president of the University until my successor, John W. Oswald, then president of the University of Kentucky, took over on September 1, 1968.

Thus ended my active career of forty-two years in full-time service with the University of California. While there were a few moments which I would have gladly foregone, these were inconsequential as compared to the many, many rewarding times which I enjoyed. I wouldn't have traded my career with the University for any other that I can imagine.
The Social Side of the Presidency

Chall: Can you tell me a little bit about the social side of the presidency. In your scrapbook I saw so many pictures of you and your wife, and the Kerr's from time to time, always meeting dignitaries from around the country and around the world--large dinner parties in formal attire, etc.

Wellman: The University of California with its high reputation attracts distinguished visitors from around the world. They all want to see the president, and he is expected to invite them to luncheon or dinner. In addition the president is expected to entertain Regents, top administrative staff members, faculty leaders, important alumni, and legislators. In order to do his job most effectively he has to do a lot of official entertaining whether he enjoys doing so or not. Chancellors also have to do much official entertaining and, in addition to the groups mentioned above, chancellors need to entertain student leaders.

On the social side of the presidency, or of the chief campus officer, the wife of the president or chancellor is at least as important as he is. Certainly during the year I was acting president Ruth was an effective and gracious "first lady" of the University and as such contributed a good deal to whatever success I had.

Ida Sproul was the model for the "first ladies" of the University who followed her and also the model for the "first ladies" of the University campuses. Kay Kerr and Nancy Hitch were her worthy successors. On the campuses I was particularly impressed with the charm and effectiveness with which Jean Aldrich (Irvine), Mary Cheadle (Santa Barbara), Ester Heyns (Berkeley), Jane McHenry (Santa Cruz), Vera Mrak (Davis) and Evelyn Spieth (Riverside) served their campuses.

The head of a campus must have the support of a majority of the faculty members of that campus in order to survive. The attitude of the faculty members toward the head of a campus is influenced to some extent at least by the attitude of the faculty wives toward the "first lady" of the campus.

Chall: As women move into careers of their own do you suppose that their role as "first ladies" will change?

Wellman: Yes, I suppose that it will, but not, I would guess, for the better.
Wellman: Only a very exceptional woman could handle creditably a full-time professional career and at the same time be an outstanding "first lady" of a university campus. And if the "first lady" has young children as well as a full-time professional job successful performance in that job will force her to neglect her role as mother or as "first lady" and probably both. Neglect of her duties as "first lady" will likely lead to a more impersonal atmosphere throughout the campus. That in my judgment would be a loss.

The University of California, 1868-1968

Chall: Verne A. Stadtman feels that you had a great deal to do with the fact that his book on the history of the University (The University of California, 1868-1968) was actually published.

Wellman: Publication was being held up. Apparently one or more Regents felt that some sections were biased in favor of Kerr. President Hitch asked me to read certain chapters in the manuscript--those relating to the time Kerr was president--and advise him on whether the book should be published. After reading those sections with considerable care I recommended publication.

Chall: Do you consider it to be a good history?

Wellman: Yes I do. Since we have been having these interviews I have re-read the entire book. I found no errors of fact. On the whole it seems to me to be well balanced. It may possibly be too favorable to Kerr, but if so, it's because several Regents who voted for Kerr's dismissal refused to comment on the drafts which Stadtman had sent to them for review.
IX POST-RETIREMENT ACTIVITIES

Chall: We are now proofreading and indexing your manuscript, and I do hope you will give us the final chapter on your activities during retirement and some "proud father" paragraph or two on your daughter. I will keep trying to get that chapter--rain or shine.*

Wellman: I would prefer not to. Why not let it rest with my experiences and observations up to the date of my retirement.**

Chall: That would leave it incomplete. You really ought to complete it. Think it over.

Wellman: All right, I'll prepare a final chapter. I am yielding to your request mainly because my wife thinks that I should. This may be another case where her judgment proves to be better than mine.***

Nancy Wellman Parmelee

Wellman: You asked me to say something about our daughter, Nancy. It is a pleasure to do so.

Nancy was born on April 18, 1932. She received a good education in the Berkeley public schools. She was a bright student graduating in the top ten in her class at Berkeley High School. In her day, Berkeley's public schools were excellent

*In letter to Wellman dated February 27, 1976.

**In telephone reply to Chall.

***In telephone call to Chall a few days later.
Wellman: places for good students. From all accounts, they are not as good today for superior students but may be as good for average students.

Nancy graduated from the University of California, Berkeley campus, with honors. Her college career was interrupted, first, by going with us to Europe in the fall of 1950 and, second, by going with her husband to Alaska for a year in 1952-53.

She was married to Robert D. Parmelee on February 1, 1952, on our thirtieth wedding anniversary. Bob had been commissioned Second Lieutenant in the United States Army on his graduation from U.C. Berkeley in June, 1951, and in the summer of 1952 was sent to the Ladd Air Force Base in Fairbanks, Alaska. Nancy followed him there. She got a job at the air base and at times during that winter went to work when it was 30° below zero, of course, Bob did also.

Nancy and Bob returned to Berkeley in the fall of 1953—he to enter Boalt Law School and she to resume her undergraduate work at U.C. Berkeley. She got a part-time job in the controller's office on the campus.

In March, 1976, Nancy completed a year's term as mayor of the town of Sonoma and, from all accounts, she carried out the duties of that office very well indeed. She has been a member of the Sonoma City Council since 1966, having been elected in 1974 to her third four-year term. Before being elected to the city council, she served four years on the city planning commission. Her goal has consistently been to keep Sonoma a good place for a family to live.

Nancy's husband, Robert D. Parmelee, is the leading attorney in Sonoma. They have three children. Mark is a sophomore at the University of California, Davis; Lori is a senior in high school and Janine, a junior.

Wellman: In January, 1970, President Hitch appointed a task force to restudy the 1966 Growth Plan of the University. He asked me to be chairman. I was pleased to do so.

The membership of the task force was large and diverse--some twenty persons including chancellors, faculty members, students, and University-wide officers.

A total of fourteen day-long meetings were held over a period of eighteen months. I personally spent a lot of time between meetings assembling information and preparing analysis for consideration by the task force. Dorothy G. Powell, assistant to the vice-president--academic affairs, was of tremendous help. The final draft of the report was written largely by Professor R.T. Wedding and edited by Mrs. Powell. It represented the views of the majority of the members of the task force.

I was among the minority members of the task force. In my letter of transmittal to President Hitch dated June 30, 1971, I said and I quote: "There did emerge, in the discussions of the task force, a number of differences in point of view concerning some of the issues. These centered mainly about the magnitude of enrollment increases which should be projected at the graduate level." Then I stated my own judgment, namely, "the graduate enrollment increases agreed upon by the majority of the task force are too high."

So far they have turned out to be much too high. In the report, graduate enrollment for the University as a whole was projected to increase from 25,288 in 1970-71 to 28,000 + 1,700 in 1974-75. The actual graduate enrollment in 1974-75 was 24,623, a slight decrease rather than a substantial increase. (The figures on enrollment are: a three-term average headcount excluding graduate students in the medical and health sciences.)

For 1980-81, the task force report showed a graduate enrollment projection of 32,000 to 36,000. The majority of the task force insisted on high enrollment projections of graduate students. They still had the hope that all of the University campuses (except San Francisco) could within the foreseeable future become general campuses. Faculty had been
Wellman: recruited with the implied promise that that would happen. The majority feared that abandonment of the general campus concept for the new and emerging campuses would result in a serious loss of morale. Also, some of them felt the Allan M. Carter analysis showing a large potential oversupply of Ph.D.s did not apply with equal force to the University of California.

On the other hand, Carter's article, "Supply and Demand for Ph.D.s," published in Science was more convincing to the minority of the task force than to the majority. I personally was of the opinion that the concept of specialized campuses at the graduate level (other than at Berkeley and Los Angeles) should replace the concept of general campuses and, the sooner that change was widely recognized as necessary, the better. I wrote a paragraph which was included in the report but which I doubt was really supported by the majority of the task force. Here it is:

During the 1970s emphasis in graduate and professional education, especially on the developing campuses, should be on greater campus specialization and on the "modular" development of selected strong programs as opposed to an even, but thin, spread of support for a large number of programs. The aim of each campus should be to build peaks of excellence rather than a broad plain of average quality. The peaks of excellence on the several campuses should complement each other, and thus build for the University as a whole a high plateau of excellence that includes all university disciplines and fields. In this way, the University of California can best meet the needs of the State without unnecessary duplication or excessive cost. The accomplishment of this goal will require a high degree of intercampus cooperation, encouraged and implemented by the University administration.

Another feature of the task force report to which I objected was the allocation of specific graduate enrollments among the campuses as was done in Table 1. I felt that the making of specific allocations for each campus for each year--1971-72 to 1980-81--was beyond the competence of the task force. Moreover, I thought that the making of specific allocations to campuses, if that had to be done, was more properly the function of the administration than of the task force. However, the vice-president--planning, Joseph W. McGuire, urged the task force to undertake
Wellman: the task, and the majority agreed to do so. From talking with McGuire, I got the impression that he felt that having the task force assume that responsibility would divert quite a bit of heat from his office.

Committee on University-Emeriti Relations

Wellman: Another activity on which I spent quite a bit of time was as a member of the Committee on University-Emeriti Relations of the Berkeley Division of the Academic Senate. This committee was established in 1971-72 at the suggestion of George R. Stewart, Professor of English Emeritus. He served as the first chairman of the committee. The other initial members were Robert B. Brode, R.A. Gordon, E.T. Grether, and myself. E.T. Grether succeeded Stewart as chairman.

I undertook two special assignments for the committee: (1) the possible establishment of a retirement residence near the Berkeley campus and (2) improvement in the retirement incomes of persons who had retired under the University of California Retirement System.

Over a period of years, my wife, Ruth, and I had visited a dozen or so retirement residences up and down the Pacific Coast from Seattle to San Diego. We learned a good deal about them. We have friends in several of them. We felt that a retirement residence adjacent to the Berkeley campus would be a desirable facility for quite a few retired University faculty and staff and we still do, although we are not ready to move into one.

The University Retirement Office kindly mailed a questionnaire to 1,235 annuitants and surviving coannuitants in the University of California Retirement System. There were 415 replies to the question, "Would you be interested in a retirement resident near the Berkeley Campus?" Of these, 106 said yes, 154 said no, and 155 said uncertain. The 106 yes replies included 50 single persons and 56 couples, a total of 162 individuals. This number was substantially below the optimum number of residences for economical operation; the optimum number we were told by experts was 250-300.
Even with an optimum number of residents, the financial problem would have been very difficult. The cost of a retirement residence housing 250-300 people would have at that time, 1973, likely exceeded $15 million excluding the cost of land. As a rough estimate, I figured that a gift of $1 million and free University land would be needed to make the project go.

Gifts totaling that amount were not in prospect, and free University land was doubtful. With regard to the latter, however, I have a hunch that the campus administration might have supported a longtime lease of People's Park at a nominal rent. To my mind, People's Park would be a desirable location for a retirement residence for retired University employees, especially for retired faculty members.

It is close to the particular facilities on the campus that retired faculty members are interested in--the library, Zellerbach Theater, Hertz Hall, the Art Museum, Wheeler Auditorium, and the faculty clubs. The area is level and close to local shops and to transportation to downtown Berkeley, Oakland, and San Francisco. Nevertheless, that particular location might be anathema to many retired persons and would likely run into strenuous opposition of radical students and street people. Ten years from now, the climate around there may well be much more tolerant.

Our committee favored the north part of the Oxford Tract as a site for a retirement center. I agree that it would be a desirable site, but I suspect that the University administration would be reluctant to lease it at a nominal rent.

The second special assignment which I undertook at the request of the Committee on University-Emeriti Relations was a comparative analysis of the retirement incomes provided by the University of California Retirement System (UCRS) and the State of California Public Employee's Retirement System (PERS).

As late as the summer of 1973, the governing board of UCRS claimed that UCRS (without Social Security) was superior to PERS with Social Security. I doubted that that claim was true.

In 1954 the University had the opportunity of entering the State Retirement System, but the Regents voted instead to develop its own system. At that time the Regents assured the faculty that their "plan will provide retirement allowances substantially equal to those provided under the State Employee's Retirement System."
Wellman: I was surprised and dismayed by my findings that the benefits to those who had retired under UCRS were markedly lower than the benefits to those who had retired under PERS coordinated with Social Security. UCRS was not coordinated with Social Security. The only retirees under UCRS who received total retirement benefits equal to those available under PERS-SS were those who had qualified for Social Security benefits by reason of outside income, royalties from books, consulting fees, etc.

In November, 1973, our committee sent a letter to the chairman of the Governing Board of UCRS, Vice-President R.L. Johnson, in which we provided a comparison of the 1973-74 retirement income of an annuitant in UCRS with what he would be receiving that year if he had retired under PERS-SS.

The common assumptions were:

Date of retirement: July 1, 1970.

Age of member (male) at date of retirement: 67 years; age of spouse, 65 years.

Highest average permissible compensation: $22,000 per year.

Years of service credit: 30 years.

Option selected: one-half continuance to co-annuitant.

The difference in retirement income was striking:

Under UCRS $12,674
Under PERS-SS $17,633
From PERS ($12,942)
From SS ($4,691)

The relative advantage of PERS-SS over UCRS was even greater since Social Security payments are exempt from both federal and state income taxes.

We urged the Governing Board to undertake promptly "a comprehensive analysis, including preretirement costs to currently retired members as well as retirement incomes."

Vice-President Johnson replied that "This is a very complex matter.... However, we are as concerned as you that UCRS benefits
Wellman: may be dropping behind and we have already started a preliminary study of the matter."

I sent copies of our committee's letter and Johnson's reply to the vice-president of the University, Chester O. McCorkle, Jr. He sent me a note saying that he had discussed the problem with President Hitch and Vice-President Johnson and that "we will be giving this matter high priority in the next few months." Then he added: "We all agree that something must be done to erase the growing inequity."

University-wide administration did pursue the matter. In recognition of the rising cost of living, the state provided substantial ad hoc increases in 1974-75 and again in 1975-76 for annuitants and co-annuitants in both PERS and UCRS. Also, the state provided funds for improvements in both systems for the active members and in 1975-76 for coordination of UCRS with Social Security.

Coordination of UCRS with Social Security cannot benefit directly those who have retired before coordination, but conceivably it might benefit them indirectly. The state may be more inclined to provide for increases in retirement income in line with increases in the cost of living. Social Security retirement pay is tied to cost of living.

California Alumni Foundation

Wellman: An important and interesting University-related project on which I was engaged for several years was helping to obtain private gifts for the Berkeley campus. I was a trustee of the California Alumni Foundation (now the U.C. Berkeley Foundation) for six years--four of those six as an officer, first vice-president--annual giving, and, next, vice-president-at-large.

I never thought that I would actively participate in soliciting private gifts for any purpose. But I soon found that it was not unpleasant to do so for a good purpose and, in fact, could be quite rewarding. Two things I learned: (1) that few people will give unless they are asked to do so and (2) that no one is insulted by being asked to give to a worthy cause--certainly support of the University is a worthy cause.
Wellman: For the past year or so, I have been the foundation's representative on the Council of the California Alumni Association. This has been an interesting assignment. Not only have I gotten acquainted with leading alumni of the Berkeley campus whom I had not met before, but I also have been impressed by the great importance that a large and active alumni association is to a university.

Berkeley-Albany YMCA

Wellman: Up to the time I retired, I had never participated in community activities in Berkeley other than in our church, even though I had lived in Berkeley for forty-five years. I looked around to see what I might be helpful in and soon became convinced that the Berkeley-Albany YMCA was a constructive force in the community. In 1970, I was asked to become a director of the YMCA, and I accepted. Shortly thereafter, the YMCA launched a capital fund drive, and a new YMCA building was constructed in South Berkeley. I solicited some of my friends living in Berkeley for contributions and found that I was not embarrassed to ask them for money for a good cause. Being a director of the Berkeley-Albany YMCA has been a nice experience. I have become acquainted with many people that I would not have otherwise met.

Bowling on the Green

Wellman: Early in 1969, I took up lawn bowling. Up to that time, I had never had a hobby. Lawn bowling soon became my hobby and has continued to be so.

I found lawn bowling to be a most enjoyable game—mild exercise outdoors, intra-club tournaments, inter-club tournaments, and grand people everywhere. A member of a lawn bowling club is always welcomed to bowl at another club anywhere in the world.

Lawn bowling is a particularly active sport in Australia, New Zealand, England, Scotland, Wales, South Africa, and in nearly every English-speaking country. At Berkeley, we have had
Wellman: many visitors from other countries. In 1974, eighty Australian lawn bowlers came to the Bay Area; and the following year forty lawn bowlers from Wales were here. Many of our members at Berkeley have bowled in other countries. I have not yet done so but expect to during the next two or three years.

Travels

Wellman: Before I retired, Ruth and I had traveled rather extensively, both in this country and abroad. We have kept up this activity since I retired. The appendix gives a list of the more important trips which Ruth and I have taken together from the time we were married. Omitted, however, are our travels solely within California and to Walla Walla, Washington, and back to see my relatives. Ruth's relatives lived in San Diego. Also, omitted are the many business trips which I took by myself, both in and outside of California.

Preparation of This History

Wellman: By far, the most time consuming of my University activities since my retirement has been the preparation of this oral history. The interviews, themselves, which were recorded on tapes did not take overly long—an hour and a half a week for thirteen weeks. But the transcripts, while accurately reporting what I had said, were terrible from my standpoint. I had not prepared adequately in advance; in fact, I had prepared almost not at all. Consequently, the material that appeared was very uneven in accuracy, in importance, in things included and omitted, in organization, and in clarity. I felt that the transcripts had to be more than just edited. They had to be rewritten and I proceeded to do so, but I did not work on them regularly. I worked on them only intermittently, fitted in between other University and community projects and personal activities (trips, lawn bowling, etc.) If I had known in advance how much time and work this history would take, I doubt that I would have agreed to undertake it. But now that it is virtually completed, I am glad I did.
Retirement Dinner

Wellman: I would like to close this history with a brief statement about my retirement dinner held on July 11, 1968. That occasion will be remembered by Ruth and me as long as we live. That evening some six hundred friends attended a retirement dinner in our honor. It was perfectly planned and executed, and it was a most joyous occasion for us. There were many surprises—the presence of our sisters from San Diego and Walla Walla, the announcement that the Regents had named Agricultural Hall on the Berkeley campus the Harry R. Wellman Hall, and a showing with comments of slides made from selected photographs taken at various stages in our lives. There were also many laudatory statements made, which as one might expect, tended to be exaggerated, although greatly appreciated by both Ruth and me. I selected one of the statements for inclusion in the appendix, a resolution adopted by the Academic Council on behalf of the faculty of the University of California on all of its campuses.
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March 12, 1952

President Robert G. Sproul
University of California
250 Administration Building
Campus

Dear President Sproul:

The Special Committee appointed by you to consider improvements in the form of the annual budget of the University and in the procedures for its preparation and presentation to The Regents makes the following recommendations:

I. The form of the budgets of individual organizational units should be changed.

1. The names of all individuals should be omitted, and in lieu thereof the total number of academic positions and the total number of nonacademic positions (equivalent full-time basis) together with the aggregate salaries of each group should be shown.

Much space in the present annual budget is taken up with the names of persons expected to be on the salary payroll during the ensuing year. The lists are frequently out of date before they are printed and they get progressively out of date during the course of the year. Moreover, the inclusion of so much detail in the budget makes it difficult to determine what, if any, significant changes are being proposed. A much clearer view of the over-all budget of the University as well as of the budgets of individual organizational units could be obtained if only the number of positions and the aggregate salaries applicable thereto were given.

Space should be provided in the budget form to permit a comparison of the proposed budget with the budgets for two or three immediately preceding years.

The number of positions should be on an equivalent full-time basis and should be separated into academic and nonacademic positions. This separation is a logical one since the kind of work performed by the academic personnel is quite different from that performed by the nonacademic personnel.

The aggregate salaries for each group as approved in the budget for the ensuing year should be computed at the salary rates of the current year, but should be made subject to two types of adjustments: (1) any merit increases in salary (including salary increases accompanying promotion in rank) granted to continuing staff members should be added; and (2) any savings from replacements of staff members who resigned during the year by new appointees, at lower salaries, and unfilled positions should be deducted.

An example of the form of budget recommended for a department of instruction and research is shown below:
In order to carry out this proposal, The Regents would need to establish annually in the over-all budget of the University the total amount of money which may be used for merit increases in salaries. This total amount should be broken down by (a) academic and nonacademic, (b) campuses, and (c) large organizational units.

The total amount of money required for merit increases in salaries on the basis of existing salary scales can be approximated closely, for the University as a whole or for a campus, and this total could be adjusted upward or downward in conformity with the decision of The Regents regarding a more or less liberal salary-increase policy for the ensuing year. The decision on individual salary increases could be made later on the basis of evidence of merit.

With the names of individuals omitted from the budget, it would be advisable to issue annually a Personnel Roster containing the names, titles, and salaries of employees and number of years at the rank and salary, grouped by organizational units. This Personnel Roster would not be a part of the budget, but it would be an administrative document based on the budget, on prior actions of The Regents regarding appointments and promotions to tenure ranks and on authority delegated to the President by The Regents (see recommendation No. VI). This document would be for internal use in the University and for the information of The Regents.
Accounting procedures could be greatly simplified if all appointments, except those specifically excepted, were considered as continuing ones. Once the initial appointment is made, a person would be continued until he resigns, is discharged, or the position is discontinued. He would be notified of any change in his salary. A change in rank or position would be processed in a manner similar to a new appointment.

2. Authority should be given the President to transfer funds between subdivisions of a departmental budget so long as the total is not thereby exceeded.

Effective and efficient operation requires flexibility in the use of funds and the opportunity to transfer funds among the several categories as the need arises. These needs cannot always be predicted accurately at the time the budget is prepared. Necessary transfers of funds within a departmental budget should be approved on the administrative level by the President (or other administrative officer designated by the President) rather than on the policy level by the Regents.

3. Each department or other organizational unit should submit with its budget request a statement of its work program and plans upon which its budget estimates have been based. This statement in justification of its budget request should be in detail, including work load figures, estimates for the coming year, unit cost figures where possible, and explanations of any requested additions to staff, new equipment, or other changes. This detailed information would be used by the administrative officers of the University in their review and revision of departmental budget requests, but suitable summaries and digests for each major organization unit, prepared by the President or officers designated by him, should accompany the budget.

II. The two budget documents now employed should be replaced by a single budget document.

The present use of two separate and distinct budget documents—the State Budget Request and the Annual Budget—complicates the budget procedure. A complete set of estimates and justifications (except for individual salary increases and promotions) are required for each budget. This duplication greatly increases the routine work of budgeting.

With the number of positions substituted for the names of individuals in the budgets of the individual organization units and with the establishment of an over-all salary increase fund, as outlined under recommendation No. I above, the adoption of a single budget document would be entirely feasible. The internal operating portion of this single budget document would be the present State Budget Request with suitable modifications.

III. Extensive summary tables should be included in the principal budget document.

The present regular operating budget consists of numerous sub-budgets, which are essentially appropriations to individual organizational units. These numerous sub-budgets are useful for internal control of expenditures, but they are not much help in charting the course of the University or in determining whether its program is properly balanced. Attention is concentrated on the individual trees which make up the forest, not on the important characteristics of the forest itself.
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The eleven summary tables contained in the 1951-52 budget are a step in the right direction. They need to be supplemented by other summary tables, and these tables should show historical comparisons.

It must be recognized that the preparation of extensive summary tables takes considerable time and involves considerable expense, but they are essential to an understanding of the budget, and justify the costs involved.

IV. A budget message by the President should be included in the principal budget document.

The President's budget message should summarize the principal features of the budget as submitted to The Regents, including significant trends and developments, any proposed new activities, any substantial extension or curtailment of present activities, and a brief explanation of the programs and budgets of various divisions of the University. It should contain an appraisal of the progress of the University, and should indicate broadly the needs of the University. It should center attention on important policy matters affecting the budget.

V. Appended to the principal budget document should be summaries of expenditures for capital outlays and contract research.

These summaries should show actual expenditures for a few past years and proposed expenditures for the coming year. The proposed expenditures would not, however, constitute authorizations. Rather they, together with the historical record of actual expenditures, would be for informational purposes.

The summary tables should be prepared for the University as a whole and for campuses.

VI. Certain procedures with respect to appointments, promotions, and salaries should be followed by The Regents.

It is realized that many of the procedures mentioned below are now in effect. These are listed along with the others in order to provide a fairly complete statement.

A. With respect to appointments and promotions, The Regents would:

1. Act on the appointment of the President of the University and on the appointments of the officers of The Regents--Secretary-Treasurer, Vice-President--Business Affairs, Controller, and Attorney.

2. After recommendation by the President of the University,

a. Act on the appointments of the other officers of the University--chancellors, vice-presidents, provosts, directors, and deans.

b. Act on appointments and promotions of the faculty to tenure ranks (associate professor and professor and equivalent ranks).

c. Act on changes in the number of positions and the amount of money involved, by individual organizational units.

3. Delegate to the President authority to make all other appointments and promotions subject to the restriction that the number of new positions and aggregate salaries for such positions shall not
exceed the number and amount authorized in the budget, except for temporary appointees paid from emergency funds.

With respect to salaries, The Regents would:

1. Act on the salary of the President of the University and on the salaries of the officers of The Regents--Secretary-Treasurer, Vice-President--Business Affairs, Controller, and Attorney.

2. After recommendation by the President of the University,
   a. Act on changes in the salary scales.
   b. Establish annually in the budget the total amount of money which may be used for merit increases in salaries, broken down by (1) academic and nonacademic, (2) campuses, and (3) large organizational units.
   c. Act on the salaries of the other officers of the University--chancellors, vice-presidents, provosts, directors, and deans.
   d. Act on increases in the salaries of individual faculty members receiving above-scale salaries.

3. Delegate to the President authority to make all other salary increases subject to the restriction that the aggregate increases in salaries shall not exceed the total amount approved in the budget for salary increases.

The adoption of the foregoing recommendations would provide The Regents full authority over the development of the University and of its operating program. The Regents would, for example, have full control over the personnel of the University at the following strategic points.

1. Selection of the officers of the University and the determination of their salaries.

2. Changes in the salary scales of both academic and nonacademic personnel.

3. Changes in the number of positions and the amount of money involved, by individual organizational units.

4. The amount of money which may be used for merit increases in salaries.

5. Appointments and promotions of individuals to tenure ranks.

6. Increases in salaries of individuals receiving above-scale salaries.
The members of the Special Committee would be pleased to answer any questions which you may have regarding its recommendations.

Respectfully submitted,

James H. Corley

Ellis J. Groff

Joseph P. Harris

Olof Lundberg

William K. Schmelzle

Harry R. Wellman (Chairman)
TO CHANCELLORS:

Re: Authority to Approve Amendments to the Operating Budget

Effective August 15, 1965, the following procedures will govern the administration of amendments to the operating budget, superseding my memorandum of August 1, 1960.

Adjustments are to be approved (a) when the justification supporting the transfer is as adequate as for the approved budget which is to be modified; (b) when the adjustment can be made without detriment to the proper conduct of operations during the remainder of the budget year, and to achievement of the campus budgetary savings target assigned by the President; and (c) when no new programs involving a continuing commitment would be involved.

Campus Accounting Officers are responsible for advising the Chancellors as to whether a particular transfer may be approved locally or must be referred to the President for approval.

Chancellors are responsible for submitting to University-wide officers such information and reports as may be requested on his exercise of the authority delegated herein.

A. Budgets for Nonacademic Salaries, General Assistance, Supplies and Expense, Equipment and Facilities, Special Items and unallocated sub-accounts, may be exceeded by the Chancellor within control points subject to the following:

1. The number of nonacademic positions (FTE man-year) may not exceed the budgeted number except for temporary positions financed from the campus provision for contingencies (Par E below) and from transfers from sub-budgets (e.g., General Assistance, Supplies and Expense, Equipment and Facilities).

2. Upward reclassifications of nonacademic personnel may be financed only from funds released in the current fiscal year by downward reclassifications, or hiring at lower levels, or from the campus Provision for Nonacademic Merit Increases and Promotions.

3. Merit increases for nonacademic personnel may be financed only from the campus Provision for Nonacademic Merit Increases and Promotions. Six-month increases should be financed from departmental funds.

4. Temporary positions must be labeled as such and must be terminated at the end of the fiscal year. Temporary positions which are to be made permanent must be included in the budget for the next succeeding fiscal year.
B. Budgets for Academic Salaries may be amended by the Chancellor within control points subject to the following:

1. The number of academic positions (FTE man-year) may not exceed the budgeted number of positions except for temporary positions financed from the campus provision for contingencies (Par E below), from the campus Provision for Sabbatical Leave Replacement, or from endowment funds.

2. Merit increases and promotions for academic personnel may be financed only from the campus Provision for Academic Merit Increases and Promotions.

3. Upgrading of academic positions may be financed from funds resulting from downgrading of positions, and from the campus Provision for Academic Merit Increases and Promotions.

4. Temporary positions may be established if labeled as such and terminated at the end of the fiscal year. If such positions are to be made permanent, they must be included in the budget for the succeeding year. Appointments to temporary positions may not be at the regular academic ranks (Professor, Associate Professor, etc.) but must be assigned the title visiting, acting, teaching assistant, teaching fellow, associate, lecturer.

5. Funds may be transferred for purchase of equipment, books or non-recurrent items, provided achievement of the campus budgetary savings target is not thereby impaired.

6. Funds may be transferred for payment of honoraria, including travel.

7. Funds may be transferred from Academic Salaries to General Assistance for the temporary employment of academic personnel such as Readers so long as budgeted FTE positions within an appropriation are not exceeded.

C. Transfers of funds (between budget accounts) may be approved by the Chancellor within each of the following appropriations (control points) subject to the restrictions listed below. Transfers between campuses or between appropriation categories shall be referred to the President.

**Appropriation Categories (Control Points)**

1. Departments of Instruction and Research - Agriculture
2. Departments of Instruction and Research - Health Sciences
3. Departments of Instruction and Research - All other Departments, and Organized Activities Related to These Departments
4. Teaching Hospitals
5. Organized Activities - Health Sciences
6. Organized Research
7. Agricultural Experiment Station
8. Libraries
9. Campus Public Service
10. Maintenance and Operation of Plant
11. General Administration and General Institutional Services and Expense
12. Student Services
13. Staff Benefits
14. Auxiliary Enterprises - Each Program
15. Student Aid
Restrictions:

a. Transfers between salaries accounts cannot increase the number of positions (FTZ) academic or nonacademic (including General Assistance) for the appropriation category (control point).

b. Transfers of funds between departments within an appropriation may not exceed $25,000, as required by Appendix B of the Standing Orders of The Regents.

c. Budgetary control will be maintained for each source of funds.

D. Upward or downward revisions of income or charges of wholly or partially self-supported service activities may be approved by the Chancellor within available funds, and provided that the revision covers estimated activity for the entire remaining portion of the fiscal year.

The Teaching Hospital budget may be revised by the Chancellor when the deviation from the original estimate is not more than 10%, subject to the availability of funds, and provided that the revision covers estimated activity for the entire remaining portion of the fiscal year.

E. Transfers of funds from Provisions for Contingencies may be approved by the Chancellor whenever the individual transfer is $15,000 or under in amount, as required by Appendix B of the Standing Orders of The Regents, provided that no such transfer shall result in establishment of a new policy, program or project involving a continuing liability, whenever the individual transfer:

1. Is to be used for academic or nonacademic salaries to establish temporary positions in excess of budgeted staff. Such temporary academic employment cannot be continued into the ensuing fiscal year on the basis of such funding, and may not be at regular academic ranks (of assistant professor, associate professor, professor), but must be assigned the title visiting, acting, teaching assistant, teaching fellow, associate, lecturer.

2. Is to be used for objects of expenditure other than academic or non-academic salaries.

3. Is limited for use by departments, activities or programs wholly or partially financed by University general funds.

F. Transfers of Funds from Endowment Income Unallocated may be approved by the Chancellor whenever the individual transfer:

1. Is in accordance with the terms of the gift, as certified to by the Campus Accounting Office.

2. Is to be used to establish a temporary academic or nonacademic position or for some other object category not representing a continuing commitment.
All transfers of funds not covered in this directive, including proposed appropriations of income not specified in Paragraph D above, should be forwarded to the President.

Any expenditures made in excess of the approved budget and any disallowances of expenditures made by the State must be met by the Chancellors from locally available non-state funds.

Clark Kerr
Resolution upon the occasion of the retirement of Vice President Wellman:

The Academic Council, acting on behalf of the faculty of the University of California, wishes to add its name to the list of those who are saluting Harry R. Wellman upon his impending retirement from active service in the affairs of the University. As we enter upon our second century it is pleasant to call to mind that Dr. Wellman has been with the University of California for almost half its first century. We have become so happily accustomed to viewing the University with Dr. Wellman acting in any one, or a combination, of a half-dozen roles that it becomes extraordinarily difficult to imagine the time when he will not be around to offer his friendly and sage advice, to make the hard decisions, and to put his shoulder to any difficult job that badly needs doing. The Academic Council, even with its brief history, is quite aware of the enormous impact which Harry Wellman has upon the affairs of the University and of the devotion with which he has dedicated his entire career. The individual members of the Council have known him long and well; indeed, who in the long reach from San Diego to Davis does not count him as a friend? They can attest through literally hundreds of man-years of personal contact to the sagacious quality of his mind, the acumen of his judgment, and the clarity of his vision.

By recording these sentiments of high regard the Academic Council sounds a note of farewell only in a formal sense. We fully expect to find Harry Wellman around the University from time to time and fully anticipate the joys of informal friendship. We wish him a happy post-retirement schedule, one which will find him working only normal hours for the continued good of the University. He cannot be replaced, since in the regards and affections of all of us there is simply no replacement for Harry Wellman.

July 10, 1968
OUR TRAVELS TOGETHER

1922: From Portland, Oregon, where we were married, to our first home in Vale, Oregon. Between Hood River and the Dalles, the train engine hit a large boulder which had fallen onto the railroad tracks. The engine turned over on its side. We were eight hours late getting to Vale.

Vale, Oregon, to Corvallis, Oregon, and return by Model T Ford. We took with us two Malheur County 4-H Club winners, one boy and one girl. It took us two long days and one night each way. We camped out en route.

Vale, Oregon, to Madison, Wisconsin. There was a railroad strike on, and the trains ran late. It took us three days and three nights to get to Madison. We arrived in a heat wave.

1923: Madison, Wisconsin, to Berkeley, California, by Model T Ford touring car. We were two weeks en route. The Lincoln Highway was mostly under construction, and there were many detours. We camped out. We got to Davis, California, about three o'clock one afternoon. It was too far to go on to Berkeley. We stayed at Davis that night in the campground across the railroad tracks from the depot. We did not know the University of California had a campus there. The next day we came to Berkeley.

1930: From Berkeley, California, to Mountain View, Alberta, Canada, and return via Yellowstone Park in a Model A Ford. Vacation. We camped out. Our tent blew down at my brother's (John) ranch outside Waterton Park around 2:00 a.m. We moved into the milk room. In Yellowstone National Park, Ruth had a tussle with a black bear over our box of groceries. She lost.

1934: From Berkeley, California, to Washington, D.C., accompanied by our daughter Nancy—age 2. Charles Lipman, dean of the UC Berkeley graduate division, was on the train going east.

1935: From Washington, D.C., to Berkeley, California, in a 1934 Ford V-8. We left Washington, D.C., with snow on the ground; and we ran into a bad dust storm in Texas. Nancy developed laryngitis en route. The dust storm in Texas didn't help her any.

1937: Berkeley, California, to Flint, Michigan, by train where we picked up a 1937 Buick Sedan (cost, $780); then on to Quebec, Canada; Washington, D.C.; and return to Berkeley. Another car ran into us when
we stopped at a red signal light in Washington, D.C. We feared that the crystal in the trunk of our car was broken. It wasn't.

1946: Berkeley, California, to Vancouver Island, British Columbia, Canada, and return in our 1937 Buick Sedan. We were told that the people in Victoria, British Columbia, were more British than the people in England. When we went to England in 1950, we found out that that statement was correct.

1947: Berkeley, California, to Logan, Utah, to attend the meeting of the Western Farm Economics Association and then to the north rim of the Grand Canyon, Bryce Canyon, and Zion Canyon—grand scenery.

1950: My first and only sabbatical leave which was spent mostly in Europe on a study of markets for California dried fruits. We sailed from New York City to Southampton, England, on the Queen Mary and returned from Le Havre, France, to New York on the Mauritania. We bought a new car in Detroit, Michigan. We ran into a heavy snowstorm in the Chicago area so we headed south. We left the snow in southern Illinois; thereafter, we had good weather and good roads.

In Europe, we visited England, Scotland, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, The Netherlands, Belgium, Austria, Italy, France, and West Germany.

1954: From Berkeley, California, to Santiago, Chile, and return. I went to Chile at the request of AID to explore the feasibility of a technical assistance program between the University of California and the University of Concepción following which we entered into a three-year contract. AID insisted that I go to Chile by way of Washington, D.C., so that I would be properly indoctrinated. That gave us the opportunity of stopping in Rio de Janeiro, Sao Paulo, and Buenos Aires on our way to Chile.

On our way home, we stopped in Peru, Ecuador, Panama, and Mexico City. While in Peru, we visited Cuzco and Machupicchu, two of the most interesting places in South America.

1960-61: California to Italy, Greece, Egypt, India, Thailand, Cambodia, Singapore, Indonesia, Hong Kong, Japan, Hawaiian Islands, and home—partly University business and partly vacation. We left California on December 22, 1960, and arrived back in Berkeley in mid-February, 1961.

Financed by the Ford Foundation, the Giannini Foundation of Agricultural Economics was assisting the University of Naples to develop a program of graduate study in agricultural economics. I spent a few days in Naples
reviewing that program. Professors R.G. Bressler and Sidney Hoos were the foundation's representatives in Naples at that time.

In 1960-61, the University of California had three programs in Indonesia, all financed by AID: Economics and Business Administration in Djakarta, Engineering in Djokjakarta, and Medicine in Surabaja. I was there on an official inspection trip paid for by AID. I personally paid my expenses for stopovers and side trips; and Ruth, as always, paid all of her expenses.

On that trip, we saw four of the world's great structures: the pyramids outside Cairo, Egypt; the Acropolis in Athens, Greece; the Taj Mahal in Agra, India; and Angkor-Wat outside Siem Reap, Cambodia.

1963: England, Germany, France, Italy, Spain, and Portugal--partly business, partly vacation. The business was visiting our education-abroad centers in Gottingen, Germany; Padua, Italy; Bordeaux, France; and Madrid, Spain, in company with President and Mrs. Kerr, Regent and Mrs. Philip Boyd, Regent and Mrs. Donald McLaughlin, and Chancellor Vernon Cheadle.

Following an evening reception for our students in Padua, we heard that President Kennedy had been assassinated. We were, of course, terribly shocked. We didn't learn any of the details until we got to Bordeaux the following evening. There was a memorial service for President Kennedy in Saint Andre Cathedral in Bordeaux. An overflow crowd attended. In Madrid, people lined up blocks outside the American Embassy to sign a memorial book.

On vacation, we spent two to three days each in London, Frankfurt, Berlin, Lisbon, Madrid, and a week in southern Spain.

1965: Tahiti, Fiji Islands, New Zealand, Australia, Philippines, Hong Kong, Taiwan, and Japan--vacation. I returned a week early at the request of President Kerr.

1966: Vacation in British Columbia, the Yukon, and Alaska. We went from Vancouver, British Columbia, to Skagway via the inland passage, stopping at Ketchikan and Juneau on our way up and at Prince Rupert on our way back. We went from Skagway to Whitehorse by train; from Whitehorse to Fairbanks by bus; from Fairbanks to Kotzebue, Nome, and Anchorage by airplane; and from Anchorage to Valdez and Haines by bus; and back to Vancouver via the inland passage, stopping at Prince Rupert.
1968: Official business of the University to education-abroad centers at Rhodes, Greece; Beirut, Lebanon; Jerusalem, Israel; Padua, Italy; Paris, France, Göttingen, Germany; Lund, Sweden; Edinburgh, Scotland; Sussex, England; and Dublin, Ireland.

We left Berkeley the day Martin Luther King was assassinated. We attended a memorial service for him in Beirut put on by students in the American University. We left Paris for Göttingen the day university students rioted which riot contributed to de Gaulle's retirement.

Immediately after I retired, Ruth and I started out on a three months' trip by automobile. We drove 14,000 miles through 28 states of the United States and four Canadian provinces visiting friends and relatives and seeing at a leisurely pace much country we had never seen before or had passed through quickly. We were impressed as never before with the amazing diversity of our land—mountains and valleys, streams and lakes, forest and fields, flat plains and rolling hills, deserts and swamps—all interlaced with roads and highways and interspersed with quiet farms and noisy cities.

1969: Seven weeks' tour of Africa. We visited 11 countries in Africa: Egypt, Ethiopia, Kenya, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia, Rhodesia, South Africa, Ghana, Ivory Coast, and Senegal. We were two weeks on a safari in Kenya, Tanzania, and Uganda—the highlight of a most interesting trip. Altogether, we traveled 14,500 miles in Africa—10,600 miles by air and 3,900 miles on land. In addition, we traveled another 14,000 miles, all by air, in getting to Africa and back.

1970: We traveled around Arizona in January and flew to Madison, Wisconsin, in June where I received an honorary degree (LLD) from the University of Wisconsin.

1971: We spent several weeks in British Columbia and Alberta, stopping at Corvallis, Oregon, for my 50th class reunion on our way up, and at Walla Walla, Washington, on our way back. The Canadian Rockies, especially around Jasper, are spectacular—surely as grand mountain scenery as any place in the world.

1972: To celebrate our Golden Wedding Anniversary, we took an ocean voyage through the Panama Canal to the Caribbean Islands and back. The ship stopped at Puerto Vallarta on the way down and at Acapulco on the way back. We had been in Panama City before but hadn't crossed the Isthmus by land or sailed through the Canal. This time we did both. In the Caribbean, we stopped at Cartagena, Colombia; Caracas, Venezuela; and visited the following islands: Barbados, Curacao, Martinique, St. Lucia, St. Thomas, and Trinidad.
The ship was the T. S. Hamburg on her maiden voyage out of San Francisco owned by the German Atlantic Line. The ship's income was mostly in dollars, and her expenses were mostly in German marks. With the devaluation of the U.S. dollar, cost exceeded income; and the ship was sold to the Soviet Union.

One trip was not enough for our Golden Wedding year. So in the fall, we took a 30-day tour to the Balkans and Russia; to Vienna by airplane; down the Danube River (it's anything but blue) by hydrofoil and riverboat, stopping at Budapest and Bucharest; across the Black Sea to Yalta; by airplane to Moscow; by railroad train to Leningrad; and by airplane thereafter to Warsaw, Cracow, Prague, Berlin (East and West), and back to San Francisco.

The residents of Leningrad seemed to us more cheerful than the residents of Moscow; partly I suppose, because Moscow is the seat of government. We spent an evening riding the underground in Moscow. The stations were beautifully decorated with paintings and adorned with statues. The trains ran on time; BART could learn something from the Moscow underground system. The streets in Moscow, Leningrad, and Yalta were extraordinarily clean. We were told that anyone caught dropping even a piece of paper on the sidewalk would be fined the equivalent of 600 U.S. dollars. We were very careful not to drop anything.

1973: Only short trips that year to Sun City, Arizona; to Ashland and Portland, Oregon; and to Walla Walla, Washington. Sun City, Arizona, is the best retirement residence that we have visited; and we have visited quite a few. If it were located just outside of Berkeley, we might possibly move there.

1974: The south rim of the Grand Canyon, Monument Valley, National Monument, and Mesa Verde. Again, we were impressed by the fact that the most spectacular scenery in the world is in North America.

In August, we joined about 100 University of California Alumni Association members on a tour to the Mediterranean. After two days in Athens, we boarded a Greek ship for a 10-day cruise, stopping at the Islands of Hydra; Rhodes; Mykonos; Crete; Malta, Sicily; Capri, and disembarked at Nice, France. The air conditioning on the ship failed the last five days of the cruise. It was hot!

In September, we spent a week in Pennsylvania; mostly at Pennsylvania State University with Jack and Rose Oswald--long-time friends of ours at Berkeley. He is currently president of Pennsylvania State University.
We drove some 700 miles to eastern Pennsylvania visiting, among other places, the Grand Canyon of Pennsylvania (nothing like the Grand Canyon of Colorado); Valley Forge; the famed, Long-Wood Gardens; and the Amish country in the south. On our way home, we stopped in Madison, Wisconsin, to visit my nephew, Robert Clodius, and his family and to see Wisconsin beat Nebraska at football. We also stopped at Spokane and spent a day at the Expo.

1975: In January we visited Arizona; in June we took our usual trip to Ashland, Oregon, to the Shakespearean Festival; and in October we spent two weeks in the Hawaiian Islands--Oahu, Hawaii, Maui, and Kauai.

1976: In February we went to El Salvador and Mexico City. We were scheduled to go to Guatemala, but the terrible earthquake there occurred four days before we left for El Salvador. Some shocks, we were told, were felt in El Salvador; but there was no damage. It's an interesting country not yet run over by tourists.

On April 17, we will take another trip to the Caribbean. This time we will fly to Miami, Florida, and board a ship there for a two weeks' cruise of eight islands--four of which we visited in 1952 and four of which we haven't yet seen.
INDEX -- Harry R. Wellman
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Corrections

Between pages 2 and 3, the caption to the upper left picture should read, "The Wellman twins--Harry Wellman is on right."

Between pages 14 and 15, the caption to the picture on the left side should read, "Ruth Gay at Oregon Agricultural College, 1920."

Pages 222, 223, and 256--"Parmalee" should be spelled "Parmelee."

Additions

Insert on page 153 between "that directive," line 12, and "I first," line 13. At the July, 1964, meeting of the President's Council of Chancellors in University house on the Berkeley campus, Kerr, who had recently returned from an eastern trip, reported that student unrest would likely be fomented by an activist group and that the Berkeley campus could be an early target. He warned the chancellors to be on their guard.
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